

INTERVIEW TRANSCRIPTS

Volume 3 of a Thesis submitted by

John Watt M.A., M.Ed., M.èS.L.

in fulfilment of the requirements for the

Degree of Doctor of Philosophy in the University of Glasgow.

Faculty of Social Sciences

Department of Education

September 1989

BEST COPY

AVAILABLE

Variable print quality

1. The sources were both political and educational, born of the
+ healthy tradition of egalitarianism in the Labour Party. The
2. change from a bilateral system could not have taken place without a powerful political push. It was even accepted by Conservative councils up here. That shows how little formal resistance there was in Scotland. There was some discontent in the educational world, a feeling that there must be other ways of organising secondary schools, but the impetus definitely came from outside schools. Powerful evidence of perceived injustices in the system began to be gathered by academics, and this was published in famous books and articles. Also, there was proof that children who had been written off as failures at 11/12 later achieved passes in national exams.

So comprehensive schools were accepted, but a lot of teachers did not know what they were. In Scotland they thought they had them already. So I would say that ideologically people here thought it was good, but they saw it strictly still in bilateral terms.

3. People in key jobs at the time of introduction were of the old guard. I do not think they were very enthusiastic about the new idea. They made sympathetic noises, but my clear impression was that they were actually against it. The thinking was elitist and separatist. It was common to find senior high schools for bright pupils with others grouped around them feeding in. So a lot of lip-service was paid to the idea, but the concept of academic excellence proved very difficult to dislodge.

4. Economic theory at the time was expansionist. Big was beautiful all over. The curriculum had to be wide, big schools were 'in'. But the big push was in England. It all came from there. The all-through school was seen in England as the right thing, so it was assumed to be right for Scotland too.
5. There was a fair bit of enthusiasm. It was in tune with contemporary politics - consensus. There was a new wave - a brave new world was dawning, with equality of opportunity for all. But, it was a bit wishy-washy. There was no serious thinking about the implications. Schools felt it was a fait accompli. There was no point in resisting. It was going to happen, so you might as well get on with it.
6. a) Her Majesty's Inspectors jumped to the tune of the party in power. They were totally committed to comprehensive education in public, telling people it was the 'in thing'. They thumped out the party line at meetings and conferences.
7. Teachers showed their usual inertia. They are never very enthusiastic about anything.
9. Heads had almost total latitude, and were never told what to do in my experience. Since no one told them what to do or how to cope with innovation, you 'did your own thing'. Regionalisation brought more prying and a greater sense of direction.
10. Parents accepted it, by and large. Some middle class parents, or parents with intelligent children were more apprehensive.

11. a) Area schools had their own localised problems, but in some there was no effect.
- b) From 1965-75 there was no great increase in the numbers fleeing the state sector to private schools. They kept their heads down, and avoided political obstacles. Only in the last two years with the teachers' dispute have parents consciously turned to the private sector.
12. It varied. It was dramatic in purpose-built comprehensive schools. Others just carried on regardless.
13. I don't think in-service training achieved a lot. Those who went were ambitious or committed, so lecturers were talking to the converted in the main.
14. Headteacher reaction varied: some were real converts, others felt obliged to have a go, others again were reactionary. Younger teachers tended to be more enthusiastic, most sheepishly followed the lead given by their head or principal teacher.
15. Purpose built schools tended to have a comprehensive ethos. Most of these made progressive noises to fulfil the new ideas. Older more established schools remained bilaterally organised, whatever it said on paper.
16. In general, secondary 1 had mixed-ability grouping variously arrived at, secondary 2 had setting, and secondary 3/secondary 4 had a very apparent certificate/non-certificate split, with some blurring in some schools. 17. There were dramatic changes in

teaching methods. Big inroads were made to the chalk and talk situation. There were new syllabuses, new books, new courses. Raising of the school leaving age had a big impact on both curriculum and methodology.

18. Teachers did scrutinise their work. Standard grade developments are a logical progression of all the activity in the 70's.
19. Many people thought they already had comprehensive schools, and that what was happening was a 20th century fruition of the ideas of John Knox. But, the whole thing was not thought through, and people found themselves up against it when reality dawned, and the full implications became apparent. I think that comprehensive education dealt a severe blow to the usual smug complacency of the Scottish educational system.
20. The notion of academic excellence has long held sway in Scottish education. Comprehensive education merely extended the lad o'pairts tradition, so that more children could go to university. Even the Ruthven report saw leisure as tacked on to formal study, but it did not exactly set the heather on fire. The comprehensive school was principally seen as a means to extend the pool of ability by finding additional untapped talent. 'Talent' in Scotland tends to be seen in terms of academic success.
21. A comprehensive school serves its local area and should have a reasonable cross-section academically and socially of the population. It should offer a clean slate start to all children

after primary, and give them the opportunity to study all subjects. A clear picture of each child's potential should emerge as a guide to its future course of study. It should also be a centre to be used by the local community.

22. The comprehensive school has not fulfilled its potential for these reasons:

- size has proved an inhibiting factor
- resources
- the common course/mixed-ability teaching gave many children a raw deal because of teacher inability cope or resistance.

In general, educational revolutions never turn out as they were intended to, and comprehensive education is no exception.

1. I was for many years convener of a research committee in ----- which gathered material from all junior secondary schools. Its aim was to improve the standards of all junior secondary schools. The idea of comprehensive schools had always been in my mind - you take the raw material in front of you as it is, and it is then the teacher's duty to ascertain individual gifts and capacities and develop them. The curriculum and the administrative side of the school should always be subservient to that. Schools should provide the circumstances for natural talent to develop. I had pronounced egalitarian/idealistic views - I think I was one of the few, and had thus to keep quiet about them - for example, that all children are more talented than every they know. It's the old Christian view - 'I come that you may live more abundantly.'
2. A bit of both, but mostly educational/humanitarian. It was an attempt to do something for the submerged masses. There was both a groundswell in the educational world, and changed circumstances in society - cf. Harold Macmillan's phrase. 'You've never had it so good'. People had a higher standard of living and wanted opportunities for their children to do well and get on.
3. All educational reports are masses of words which need yeast. They mean nothing unless people cause action to be taken as a result. They rarely have a cataclysmic effect. In any case most teachers live a quiet life of desperation with their noses to the grindstone, and have little time to ponder on matters of

educational significance.

5. It was in line with my ideas. Some of my colleagues agreed with its content, but most took no notice. Their real concern was getting through the syllabus and their day's work.
6. 1) Some Inspectors were more sympathetic than others. They were aware of the snags and difficulties involved. They didn't push it, nor did they have many constructive suggestions to make when asked for advice, since they themselves had never taught in a comprehensive school. I always felt theirs was a superfluous job, and didn't have much time for what they said as a result.
- 2) I never had any trouble with Councillors. They were generally cordial and helpful, and worked with me to achieve my ends, since they belonged to the Labour Party.
- 3) Didn't have any advisers to start with. Very much depends on the individual.
- 4) -----'s predecessor was a dictator who was feared. He ruled by circular. ----- on the other hand was a quiet reasonable man who listened. Very little that came from the education offices had to do with the day-to-day work of the school anyway. Even if it had I was working in line with government policy.
7. The size of some of the new schools. With 1500 x pupils, a headteacher's influence gets dissipated, and you haven't the same direct control. There was also the reaction of teachers which was very mixed.

8. Headteachers are always key people in any educational development of magnitude. Much depends on the lead they give.
9. Headteachers had a completely free hand. There was never any interference from the office - in fact those in the office hardly ever were aware of what we were doing.
10. I would say that on the whole it was welcomed, unless it was seen as diluting a good school with a fine academic record. The new purpose-built ones were best. Certainly, it was hailed as a great advance by the parents of children who would formerly have gone to a junior secondary. The effects of selection at 11+ were very distressing and harrowing. Parents would do anything (literally) to get their kids into a senior secondary. I have heard parents say 'I'd rather lose an arm than have Amanda fail her control', or 'If my daughter doesn't get into ----- School (a senior secondary) her chances of a good marriage are gone'. So comprehensive schools ameliorated the position by removing the great divide at 11+. There was no longer a barrier of failure. Pupils were not marked for life. So I'd say that, if nothing else, comprehensive schools provided a welcome social service.
11. Most teachers passively accepted it - as they usually do with any change. There was no hue and cry about it. They did what they thought best for all kids. In 1964 ----- and I went to see big comprehensives in London. I was very impressed, especially by Kidbrooke. In ----- we had a deliberate policy of a common course with mixed-ability classes in secondary 1, and setting in secondary 2 but with enough flexibility to allow

movement. We also had prizes for things other than academic excellence, and for affective things like effort etc.

13. There was no comparison. Right from the start the atmosphere was better. All kids were in the one pot, so to speak. No one was divided or looked down on, as in the junior secondary. Exams were played down until the upper reaches of the school.
14. They served a very useful purpose, especially since most teachers haven't time on a-day-to-day basis to reflect and discuss ideas about curriculum or methods. The interchange of ideas stimulated a lot, I think, but I can't say what actual effect it had in classrooms.
16. They showed no wild enthusiasm, nor any overt antagonism. Basically, heads in former senior secondary schools just weren't interested in less able or junior secondary kids. Their main concern was with the able, and making sure nothing happened to them.
17. In internal practices in school, not a great deal. So much depended on the head's philosophy and enthusiasm.
18. Mixed-ability in secondary 1, setting according to ability thereafter, but with permanent flexibility.
19. Teacher's attitudes did not change much. Basically, they taught the subject, not the children. Any effect on curriculum/methods was definitely age-related among the teachers. Older ones were

thirled to former ways and practices.

20. 'Good' teachers did, but there are a lot of people in teaching who should not be there. They just weren't meant to be teachers. They cannot teach, nor in some cases relate to kids.
21. With the centuries old, lad o'pairts tradition, this was a big change, because Scottish education had never formally been asked to cater meaningfully for less able children. I'd say it was a culture shock for many teachers, who preferred to forget about less able children as if they did not exist. They were sorely neglected in the old system. The comprehensive ideal was foreign to most Scottish teachers.
22. Let the able succeed, and the others do what they can. The implication of the prevailing elitist views was that for Scottish teachers 'ability' = 'academic ability'. Other talents or qualities never came into the picture. Marks and exams were the Gods. That's why junior secondary schools were so bad - mere reflections of senior secondary curricula and methods, because that was all teachers knew. They had never been asked to think in any other terms.
23. A comprehensive school is a state organisation in which boys and girls from the one neighbourhood go to the same school. It is the duty of the headteacher and his colleagues to mount courses and teach them in such a way that all pupils' skills and talents are first detected, then developed as fully as possible. Selection is then made positively i.e. to make the best of every

child's potential. So it's a fair start for all, and a fair follow-up afterwards.

24. No, because they started out too big. Also, many did not have pupils from mixed social backgrounds. There must be social leavening in the academic mix. Also, the attitudes of senior staff and all teachers are vital. These can hardly be said to have been enthusiastic.

POSTSCRIPT:

When I left ----- Academy to go as headmaster to ----- Junior secondary school, my colleagues thought I had chosen voluntary banishment to Siberia. Good teachers were sent to senior secondary schools, and bad teachers were sent to junior secondary schools, but even they complained to the Director of Education. With no exams, and pupils seen as nothing but hewers of wood, there was widespread defeatism in both staff and pupils. Junior secondary schools never succeeded either because people felt 'WHY BOTHER?', or because heads and staffs could not or would not carry out original work.

PREAMBLE

The concept of the comprehensive school is one of a number of features of Scottish education which is now dying. Education traditionally follows societal pressures and expectations, rarely leads or shapes them. This single fact accounts for the problems it faces almost constantly. This is exacerbated by the expectation that it should provide a service and cater for needs identified by people outside the system. Schools are always expected to deliver the goods. There is accordingly always about a 5 year gap between the identification of the need and the creation of courses in schools in response to it. This accounts for the fact that in education nothing is static, and for the fact that the system is characterised by inbuilt obsolescence by the time new ideas take root, they are out of date. I think that comprehensive education is one trend in the vast turmoil of the 60s and 70s, and has to be seen against the background sketched above. The comprehensive school as we know it will die in the 1990s.

1. It all started in England, where the grammar school/secondary modern cleavage was well-known. We had nowhere near the same problems here, as a far higher percentage of pupils got into senior secondary schools. We also had multilateral schools in rural districts, so there was little perception of unfairness or denial of opportunity up here. So comprehensive education was a totally English initiative, with no Scottish impulse. The Scottish office had to issue Circular 600 because the DES had issued 10/65: it was a national policy for England which crossed the Border into Scotland. So it would be right to say that

comprehensive education happened for educational reasons in England but for political reasons in Scotland. Circular 600 was a surprise when it came out. It appeared out of the blue. No one took it seriously to start with, because it was thought that Scotland had had comprehensive schools for years. The Inspectorate were thrown into a guddle by it, and had to change their tune overnight.

It is also fair to say, in passing, that junior secondary schools were dreadful places in the main, very much second class establishments that got the worst of everything - staff, pupils, materials. There was some resentment over families being split between senior secondary/junior secondary schools, and many appeals were made to the Directorate, and even the Secretary of State, to overturn decisions.

3. I would say that the 1947 Report was in fact an obstacle to the creation of the comprehensive education. It was the staple text in post-war college and university courses, and was very highly regarded as a seminal document. But, it was based on the elitist notion of education according to age, ability and aptitude with the implication of obligatory differentiation. A whole generation of teachers were brought up on that diet, and it shaped their philosophy. Circulars 600/614 implied the very opposite view.
4. Apart from the obvious changes in society around this time (affluence, opportunities, expectations), education began to change in the early 60's because of the war and Sputnik. Britain was growing aware of the scientific age, and there was a fear

that we would be left trailing behind other countries. That's why the first real attempts at curriculum development were in maths and science. Syllabuses were changed, and there was a gradual reduction in Scottish Education Department direction and a noticeable encouragement to experiment. It was also novel that teachers were actively involved in this change. It is important to note that the net effect of the curriculum development revolution which was started then has been to repeatedly deskill the teaching profession by telling them that what they are doing is wrong. This has caused serious instability in the profession.

5. The main implications of Circular C600 as I see them were:
+
7.
- an administrative problem: how do you produce a thing called a comprehensive school?
 - as a result, there were building programmes, amalgamations and split site schools, annexes and huts and extensions
 - no more money was made available
 - questions of size of roll figured in discussions
 - there was no commonality among schools either in what they were or what they did. Physical amenities and internal practice varied so much that it was difficult to make fair comparisons
 - there was a serious staffing shortage, and battles over dilution of the profession, largely as a result of post war demography - The bulge!
 - comprehensive education could not have been introduced at a worse time, with serious shortages of accommodation and qualified staff
 - then there was the huge problem of an outdated, largely

academic curriculum, with staff attitudes and practices to match

- also, terms were never defined. No guidance was given on phrased which gained great currency - 'common course', 'mixed-ability', 'period of orientation', and not least, 'comprehensive school'.

All was imposed from outside schools, and this created antagonism and a lack of conviction that the philosophy which was being advocated was wise.

- and on top of it all came the announcement about raising of the school leaving age.

The main obstacle to the introduction of comprehensive education was the fact that it heralded a period of rapid and fundamental changes in schools, for which the preparation was non-existent or amateurish, (e.g. banding of Ordinary grade in 1973!), so that even committed staff were bewildered, confused and unsettled.

6. a) Her Majesty's Inspectors were not much help. They came round schools looking for good ideas and practice to convert into official policy to peddle to other schools.
- c) Directors, or more properly advisers, played a far greater role in terms of provision of resources and materials. Advisers were created because Directors couldn't handle the workload. They were concerned with the roofs over heads aspects.
- b) Councillors didn't know the first thing about it. Anyone with any experience of working on the Education Committee could tell you that. It was matter of party policy.

9. Headteachers got no direction and were left to their own devices. General policy was announced, but if you wanted to, you could easily devise ways of getting round it. No one bothered. You could do as you liked. Nothing you did was ever checked.
12. As far as internal organisation within schools was concerned, there was a realisation on the part of the Directorate that prescription and compulsion was wrong. The attitude was: you (the headteacher) are paid to come up with the answers. That is why there was such a variety of approaches. Each headteacher adopted a way of arranging his school that he thought would work. It was also traditional practice that the head was responsible for internal matters. Indeed, I would say that with the arrival of the comprehensive school, the freedom of the head was increased since he was encouraged to experiment to find workable solutions. It is also important to remember that heads had a responsibility for the education of their pupils. Few were willing as a result to be too ambitious in the changes they introduced, in case the 'new ideas' did not work.
13. In-service training, in my view, did not help with the complexities which came along in the train of comprehensive education. The philosophy adopted was obviously to decentralise support for teachers, rather than centralise it, which was felt not to work. But they got it wrong, because needs were not met by advisers or college lecturers. Assistance has to come into schools, problems have to be faced in situ to be fully successful. We have always confused actual training of teachers and the provision of materials for them to use. Also, in-service

was voluntary, so only a few got whatever benefits it had to offer. We have had almost no in-service training in Scotland, only curriculum development.

14. The plain fact is that comprehensive education did not go down well and, in general, was not accepted willingly by those in post at the time. Frankly, the background and training of a large majority of teachers militated against seeing education in broader terms. They could not begin to envisage what provision could be made for children who could not cope with the demands of academic work. Of course, many realised quickly that to get on you had to speak the comprehensive language. Many senior appointments were made on the strength of what promises people made at interviews. Some promised their lives away. Gradually then, by 1970 you had an infusion of people at headteacher and principal teacher level who were at least behind the comprehensive theory in principle. How genuine they continued to be when it got down to the practical problems in implementing it in their schools is another question.

They also appeared in schools a new generation of teachers who had accepted the comprehensive idea. Those trained 1966-70 had a greater sense of social commitment (c.f. the events of 1968) and were more politicised. Also, guidance was imposed to cope with curricular choice. Formerly you did a course (one language, two language etc) now things had been ostensibly liberalised. You had a free choice. Teachers and schools were expected to become social enterprises to cope with all the ills of society. So new burdens were put on schools when the solution to other problems (curriculum, assessment, buildings) had not yet been found.

17. Big differences did occur in the curriculum and in teaching methods, but they were not entirely due to comprehensive education. It was only one aspect of the troubled state of education in the 1960's - 1970's. Much would have happened anyway, even if Circular 600 had not been issued. Society was changing all around. Raising of the school leaving age was a failure, and was directly responsible for setting up the Munn and Dunning Committees. Bad staffing, a pressurised teaching force, and teachers thirled to old ways militated against any real development.

19. People in schools don't think in terms of 'the Scottish
+ educational tradition', or 'equality of opportunity'. But there
20. is a very distinct Scottish tradition which permeates the service, and has been perpetuated in the comprehensive scheme of things.

The main contribution of comprehensive education has been to remove the control exam. This in turn meant that all children had an 'equal' opportunity to take advantage of what the secondary school had to offer.

A lot of key terms were never - and have never been - defined. Above all, the term 'comprehensive school' has come to mean all things to all men. It has to do with catchment areas, size, courses and teaching, and the fact that there is no entrance examination. A social balance is important, as the achievement potential of areas varies. The fundamental problem is that no one really sat down and thought through the implications of what seemed on the surface a very attractive idea. Especially what happens if, by bringing all children together in one school, you

actually dilute opportunities. I am sure in this connection that the creation of comprehensive schools has not advantaged very able children in working class districts.

22. It is very obvious from all that I have said that the potential of the comprehensive schools almost could not be fulfilled from the outset, given the nature of change in the educational system. Obvious obstacles have been:

- size
- social composition of certain areas
- staffing
- resources and cutbacks
- buildings
- teacher attitude
- recent government education policy.

Also, it should be said that Regionalisation did not help. In the old counties it was cosy. You had contacts with officials and relationships were good. There was more real concern for what happened in schools. Now it's all bureaucratic and impersonal with several tiers of administration. All the power resides at the top, and accountability is totally vertical. This means that schools (at the bottom of the pile) are totally removed from the centre of decision making, and are passive recipients of policy decisions about which they were not consulted. The headteachers autonomy has been reduced. You are made aware that a buzz of decision-making occurs somewhere 'up there' above you, and you'll be the last to know. Councillors too are much more aware than they were. Things are done for almost totally political reasons. A final comment:

comprehensive education had a difficult birth, an extremely
fraught life, and will expire in equally difficult circumstances
in the next few years.

1. I think moves to introduce comprehensive education arose principally from a negative angle - a growing realisation that junior secondary schools were dreadful places on the whole. It took a long time and a great deal of discussion and there was a great deal of behind the scenes agitation in a political sense. However, the idea of comprehensive education aroused suspicion and even hostility among Scottish teachers. Equality was a fine notion in principle, but not at the expense of the able children who were going through the system. So I would say that awareness of an unworkable system gradually grew, until politicians mounted a deliberate campaign to dismantle it.
2. The thrust was quite definitely political. There were a few good junior secondary schools but most provided nothing more than a glorified primary education. If you had a core of dedicated, stable staff, then what the pupils got was good. By and large, however, junior secondary education was merely keeping the children happy, containing the disciplinary side of things. The educational diet was very bad, in some cases appalling. Junior secondary schools had huge staff turnover problems, and generally were not well-regarded, especially by senior secondary teachers.
3. The 1947 Report was a key educational document, but was only read at an exotic level, by senior Inspectors and Scottish Education Department officials. There was a low level of awareness of it among teachers. Those who did read it probably saw it as ambitious and too theoretical. There was no implementation of

its ideas, to my knowledge. You must also remember that, at that time, the mechanisms and structure for professional consultation and debate were non-existent compared with the situation today. Things were very much more haphazard, with the odd Inspectors doing random sampling and writing a report. There was no in-service to speak of.

4. I am sure it was a case of an idea having its time. There were strands in society in the 1960's which made the idea attractive, but as I have said, my perception was of a strong political drive and will to create comprehensive schools.
5. The immediate consequences of Circulars 600/C614 were a baffled and bewildered teaching force. There had been absolutely no consultation and preparation for the change, and consequently no understanding or grasp of the implications of real comprehensive education. Although those on high were decreeing that schools should be comprehensive, there was no spelling out of what that entailed. The death of control/qualifying tests was seized by primary schools as an opportunity to liberate the primary 6/primary 7 curriculum. No such sudden enthusiasm was evident in the secondary sector. It was a case of putting all local children under one secondary roof - an organisational/structural change which was seen as horrendous enough, without any desire or attempt to adapt the educational provision to suit the broader spectrum of ability. A very limited view was taken and it was generally seen as an externally imposed decision, which caused most secondary staff enormous headaches, and made a lot of them cling stubbornly to practices they had followed for years. It

also caused a change in status for many teachers. You see, teaching reputations were founded on experience of an success in Scottish Certificate of Education exams with selected pupils. Teachers with Honours Degrees were lords who looked down privately on lesser qualified colleagues. For a time, comprehensive education intensified these divisions based on qualifications, and many people were marked as former junior secondary teachers. There was discrimination against Ordinary graduates and diplomates. A lot of teachers were embittered at what they saw as a blow to their professional ego.

6. a) There was a big Inspectorate input on comprehensive education at several levels. They acted as consultants, suggested ideas to be tried, and picked up examples of good practice from the national scene of which they had an overview. At a practical level, many working parties and panels which sprang were either Inspectorate - instigated or Inspectorate-led. Although they did a lot, it was ad-hoc and bitty, with no coordination according to agreed criteria set down beforehand.
- b) Local politicians made political statements in public and in the press, but took no steps to further the idea. They thought it was a good thing to push, but hadn't an idea of what was really involved.
- c) Directorate staff were absorbed with the organisational aspects of comprehensivisation. Their educational input was to set up mechanisms whereby keen teachers could meet to discuss communal problems.
- d) Advisers did make a contribution at subject level, but much early

advisory work was Scottish Certificate of Education - orientated. Some were pushed into action by teachers who were desperate for help. Most of them had only senior secondary experience, and de facto no knowledge of the situation teachers had to face. No former junior secondary teacher ever became an adviser! So a lot of their input was theoretical rather than practical. Some were instrumental in setting up subject associations for keen teachers who were at a loss in dealing with comprehensive intakes.

- e) The early Consultative Committee on the Curriculum didn't cover the whole curriculum. Its work was ad hoc and responded to needs identified and voiced by Her Majesty's Inspectors. This was a political dimension - the Consultative Committee on the Curriculum concentrated on what Her Majesty's Inspectors thought the country needed - English, Maths, Science and Social Subjects. But there was no overall plan, so the curriculum papers were published, and it was up to headteachers/advisers to follow them up if they wanted.

- 7. The major obstacle in my view to comprehensive education taking root was the total failure to prepare and educate teachers to an understanding of a new educational world. It was a sudden and massive change in educational thinking which was conceived in mainly organisational terms. It was very much a case of letting people sink or swim as best they might. The teachers who had to carry out the political decision and deal with its implications were dreadfully neglected. There was also a failure to convey the beneficial effects to parents. Inevitably, therefore, old practices went on much as before. Pupils continued to be

separated on ability. In Scotland, the comprehensive school was seen very much as an organisational institution. Only gradually was there an evolution in thinking to include the educational side of things.

8. Headteachers had almost total latitude and no guidelines or directives - only suggestions. Thus you almost had as many versions of a comprehensive school as you had headteachers! There was no spelling out or attempts to impose ideas till well into the 1970's. Comprehensive education was a label, but no one really knew what it meant. The professionals were able to baffle the politicians into thinking that comprehensive education was happening and working. There was no theory or development because everyone felt insecure in the new world. It was very much a case of 'get them all under one roof and we have a comprehensive school'. Initially there was hardly any examination of what went on in the name of comprehensive education.

9. Parents and the general public displayed apathy on the whole. Any concern was at an individual level. Some parents removed their children from certain schools, or moved house to a more 'desirable' area. The private sector noticed a slight increase in recruitment at this time. But such concern was for social rather than educational reasons, out of a fear for their children mixing with 'undesirable' pupils.

10. All I can say is that the private sector is so small in the West of Scotland that it hardly affects the state sector provision.

Area schools in housing estates are the result of social policy, and were an obstacle to the creation of a comprehensive system. They had - and have - a very poor image, even though some excellent work went on in them.

11. Internal reform and reorganisation didn't really begin till raising of the school leaving age in 1972. It concentrated the professional mind. Again it was a reaction to a negative impulse - how to deal with 'pressed men'. The Pack Report in 1977 was a manifestation of how people coped with comprehensive education. Raising of the school leaving age meant that the problems of comprehensive education couldn't be ignored any longer. It was realised that it wasn't just an extra year tacked on to secondary 3, but secondary 1-secondary 4 had to be seen as a complete package. This forced people back to look at secondary 1/2 and alter their approach so as not to lose pupils early. Raising of the school leaving age caused curriculum development to take off.
12. In-service provision was uneven. Some courses were excellent. In general those that pushed the theory were not welcomed. Those which concentrated on pedagogy/methods were. Again, however, things were not coordinated, and also operated on the voluntary principle. So only keen people went along. It depended very much on how strongly participants pushed the ideas they picked up.
13. a) Headteachers made an individual response. The names of those committed to comprehensive education were well-known, and they were invited to preach at courses. Equally the opponents were -

and are - well-known. Given their academic background, I would say that most headteachers were dragged reluctantly into comprehensive schools.

b) With teachers, it depended on subject and experience. Junior secondary, remedial and Physical Education teachers were well-disposed, because they were seeing a 'better' type of pupils. Practically all other subject teachers saw it as a retrograde step, and so did not demonstrate a great willingness to swim with the comprehensive tide. Even teachers who had been pupils at comprehensives had been educated in selected groups, and did not seem to have picked up much in the way of comprehensive principles during their training. People learned from good heads and principal teachers. As time went on, the threat of comprehensive education diminished and the confidence of the teaching force built up.

16. The effect of comprehensive education on both the curriculum and methods was radical. The comprehensive education was a great catalyst to change in both spheres. It made teachers more critical of what they were offering, and overall has led to a greater concern for catering for individual abilities.

17. The changeover to a comprehensive system has caused teachers to scrutinise their methods in a fundamental way. The massive effect of the Scottish Exam Board with its panels in this respect is not always appreciated. Assessment - led innovation has forced teachers' hands. This work started at Scottish Certificate of Education level and gradually filtered down.

18. I would say that for most of Scotland outwith the Western conurbation and Edinburgh, the comprehensive school was not a radical innovation, at least in theory. In the West, it most certainly was. In fact, it was nothing short of revolutionary!
19. Equality of opportunity has long been associated in Scotland with the lad o'pairts concept. It was a slogan which was accepted as long as it did not involve harmful effects on the able pupil. There's a strong feeling in Scotland that we've always had equality of opportunity. This myth is used to glorify our alleged greatness in the past.
20. The essence of comprehensive education for me is valuing each child equally for the individual he/she is in the context of their own community, and trying to develop their potential in relation to where they are coming from and where they might reasonably aspire to end up. A comprehensive school seeks to foster pupils' strengths, and concentrates not solely on academic potential. We must never forget that true comprehensive education is an ideal: all we can reasonably do is try our best to get as close to attaining it as we can. Incidentally, I think that we already have for all sorts of pupils in all sorts of ways.
21. The principal inhibiting factor to realising the potential of the comprehensive school has been discrimination against pupils who do not measure up to narrow academic criteria. There has been for too long a narrow definition of ability and personal worth. We are on the way now to making better provision for all, but it

has taken a long, long time to effect the attitudinal change required. The expectations in the change to a comprehensive system were massive but unrealised at the time: it has taken ages to absorb the implications, so that change has occurred at the rate of a dripping tap.

1. The pressure for comprehensive schools was undoubtedly political. Labour Party members had been convinced that working class children were not getting a fair crack of the whip in the education system, not getting equal opportunities from the word go. I do not wish to imply that political pressure is necessarily wrong. It is sometimes necessary to bring about change.
2. Some members of the teaching profession felt that the IQ was all wrong. Most were indifferent, some even saw it as fair. My own view is that, with all its weaknesses, the present system is fairer. Junior secondary schools were a travesty of education, with a few notable exceptions, but most were the end.
3. The 1947 Report had no effect whatever. In any case, it advocated the multilateral school. It was well-written, and way ahead of the educational thinking of the immediate post war years.
4. The main reason in Scotland was the stigma of failure attaching to junior secondary schools, and the fact that some children sent there were obviously misplaced.
5. Circular 614 introduced the educational implications of Circular C600 which was wholly political in inspiration. Willie Ross was very influential in what went into both. Both caused an enormous upturn in a totally selective system. It took years to adapt and

change attitudes. Most schools in ----- were organised multilaterally in 1965, and there were still junior secondary schools. Buildings also caused problems. There was much reservation too about the common course and mixed-ability classes, both of which were ill-thought out. Staff shortage did not help. The reality was that comprehensive notions and fine ideals were broken by the reality of the world onto which they were foisted. A lot of what was expected was beyond many teachers, and so they either resisted change or reverted to what they knew, or watered it down for children with no academic inclinations.

6. a) The Her Majesty's Inspectors pushed it strongly. It was sheer propaganda at conferences and seminars - the new gospel according to the Scottish Education Department! It clearly was not a matter of discussion. It was going to happen, no matter what objections were put up. The feeling at these meetings was that we were there to be told what was to happen in our schools. It was a government decision which was taken then pushed by the civil servants.
- b) Local politicians had not much effect on events.
- c) Directors had to obey their Education Committees, but it wasn't a problem in ----- because the Director genuinely believed in it and wanted it.
- d) Advisers, in my view, were servants of the Directorate in the field, whose job was to explain the new deal to ordinary teachers, and get them into the right frame of mind to put it into practice.

7. The main obstacles were, money, bricks and mortar, demurring, selectively-minded staff.
10. Parents in general voiced no objections.
9. Headteachers had a great deal of latitude. The Director laid out broad guidelines on matters of policy and principle, but in your own school you did what you liked. The result was a rash of bogus 'comprehensive' schools from the word go, where pupils were graded on ability.
10. Area schools and private schools caused no problems in our county. The numbers of pupils involved were very small.
12. Internal organisational changes - how much? when? if at all? - was a matter entirely for the head. They did what they liked and thought best. The concern was always to accommodate new ideas only as long as they did not harm able children.
13. Teachers' Centres and In-service courses helped to encourage teachers who attended them to come out of the Dark Ages. Many teachers think they have nothing to learn when they start teaching, so it was an excellent development. It refreshed minds and techniques. The only problem was it was voluntary, so many teachers slipped through the net, although a lot of opportunity came their way.
14. a) Headteachers resented the bulldozer aspect of the change, but got on with it in their own way. There was no outright opposition.

They accepted it and reacted co-operatively in the main.

b) Opinions among teachers varied. A lot depended on where, how long and in what kind of school you taught. I could not say it was welcomed, but most did their best.

15. The main change from the junior secondary/senior secondary set up was the break now came at 14 and was called 'CERTIFICATE'/'NON-CERTIFICATE'. The junior secondary department or groups emerged in secondary 3. Theoretically, schools were comprehensive, with no IQ marks etc., but heads used primary reports to fulfil the same function.

16. a) mixed-ability classes were generally held to damage clever children, so were ended quickly.

b) by the time children went into third year they were either certificate or non-certificate in the main, with some of the latter attempting one or two Ordinary grades possibly.

17. a) Yes, most subjects got a new look - new textbooks and new exams. Also more children than ever before got more subjects.

b) There were new approaches like audio/visual, language labs, an emphasis on talk rather than written work, rather than fundamental changes in methods of teaching. Also worksheets arrived in virtually all subjects. Most teachers though are conservative at heart. They are interested in basics with no frills or fancy new theories.

18. The main thing which teachers did in this respect was come to

terms with what should be done with the less able pupil.

19. It articulated with what the Scottish people believed their educational system had always done - by giving everyone an equal chance. In reality, it caused considerable upheaval. In the West merging junior secondary schools and prestigious senior secondary schools with established academic reputations was not well-received.
20. In Scotland, this concept was taken to mean equality of opportunity to get on and go to a university or college. But pupil motivations and aspirations are fixed. You can take a horse to water, but you cannot make it drink. Some children, as a result of their background, do not want to use opportunity even when it is there for them. That will never change.
21. a) A comprehensive school should allow all children from the area it serves to reach their maximum academic achievement, whatever level that is. All extra-curricular activities should be open to all pupils. The Parents' Charter has killed this idea.
22. Lack of money and the economic crisis of the day have always prevented the proper expenditure on state education.

Teachers have changed the mid sixties - the old professionalism is out. Children are also different, affected by the wider society in which they live.

Hence, the comprehensive school has not gained the prestige it should have, and has not fulfilled its potential.

1. From my recollection, initiatives for comprehensive schools came from Glasgow Corporation Education Department via headteachers. My first headteacher ----- at ----- Secondary was a comprehensive zealot who infected others with his enthusiasm. It was a new purpose-built area school. It made much more impact on me than my training at Jordanhill, where I heard nothing about comprehensive schools at all. It was almost totally subject-oriented. Although it should be added that the staff at ----- came from a variety of backgrounds, and was split on the comprehensive issue. My experience there taught me that in the final analysis, real change in education depends on personalities more than any other single factor.

2. Comprehensive schools arose from political theory. It was very much a feeling of 'we're a' Jock Tamson's brains' in the 1960's. This, of course, came in for scathing attacks in the lunchtime staffroom discussions, which gave me some of the best in-service training I ever got in my life. Dr. Mackintosh called staffrooms the 'great dialectic forums' of the City. There was a mixture of politics and education, but I would say that the political dimension gave a cutting edge to the educational arguments. Comprehensive schools weren't just being pushed by Labour Party hacks. The political mistake made was to raise people's expectations that through the comprehensive school the millennium would arrive next Tuesday. The philosophy appealed to the idealistic young teachers, 'comprehensive virgins' fresh from Jordanhill, and untainted by horrific experiences in junior

secondary schools. People like Gardner and Christie were John-the-Baptist like figures, men of golden words. People who had been in junior secondary schools fell into two camps - those who were pro-comprehensive from a sense of escape from unhappy experiences, even if they suspected the motives of the new age; and those who still felt that in junior secondary schools kids got a better deal and a sense of achievement.

3. I never heard of the 1947 Report until I was on the Educational Institute of Scotland Education Committee in the 1970's. It made no impact at all on teachers in the 1950's and 1960's.
4. Circular 600 put the official seal on something that was already happening in Glasgow. The all-through school became the school of the future. 4-year schools were simply upgraded. It is not an exaggeration to say that Willie Ross took his cue from developments in Glasgow. Older schools in the city centre were left virtually untouched. Amalgamations with junior secondary schools caused big fights.
6. a) Her Majesty's Inspectors are undoubtedly agents of change in the subject development field. There they made a monumental impact without doubt. I am not sure, however, how they stand on broader educational issues. I suspect they wait for their superiors' voices to say first without committing themselves.
- b) I don't recall local politicians entering into public discussion on the issue. They would be old Glasgow hacks, party line men, who would vote the 'right' way on major issues.

- c) The Directorate dealt with administrative matters and left comprehensive policy to be acted out in schools, usually through chosen headteachers.
 - d) Advisers were a mixed bunch. The best of them helped. They were the apparatchics, in the business of spreading the gospel in subject areas in schools.
 - e) The Consultative Committee on the Curriculum didn't have much impact in schools but rather on advisers and college staff, whom it pointed in the right direction. Its influence was therefore indirect on what happened in schools.
7. What happened in schools was the decision of the headteacher.
+
8. Politicians saw no obstacles to achieving comprehensive education
+
9. in practice as well as principle. All the obstacles and problems were inside schools. There was a massive lack of staff trained to handle the implications of the new philosophy, insufficient staff of the right type to make the new world a reality. Heads and principal teachers had total latitude, so 'old guard' attitudes were allowed to prevail. The problem was not lack of resources, it was lack of know-how to do what parents and politicians expected us to do.
10. Parental reaction was minimal, as far as I recall. Parents and schools have always been separated by a gulf.
11. a) Neither area schools nor fee-paying schools caused any problems
+
- b) for comprehensive education. Bussing was a non-starter, so you just got on with creating as good an ethos in your own school as

you could. Housing scheme schools are a fact of life.

12. The extent of internal change in schools was the sole decision of the headteacher. To start with, the comprehensive school was not seen as providing a comprehensive education. Many, ----- included, were rigidly streamed. But then writers like Brian Simon brought out notions like the common course and mixed-ability classes. These were essentially political ideas introduced when it was realised that earlier expectations about pupil integration had been naive.
13. Teachers' Centres and in-service were a great help, even if sometimes amateurish. It was a very enthusiastic time, with Advisers and teachers working together. They shared the assumptions of the zealot, and kidded themselves on that they were having an impact on all schools. We know now of course that a working party can produce all the materials under the sun - whether and how they are used depends entirely on the headteacher and/or principal teacher. You run into the 'this is how we do it here' mentality, and that is the end of the story.
14. Reactions to comprehensive education were dotted along all points of a spectrum running from enthusiasm through scepticism to hostility. The first group was in the minority. As the years went on, even they began to ask: WHERE DID IT ALL GO WRONG?
15. The previous junior secondary/senior secondary pattern didn't change much to begin with. Many criticized or refused to implement the new scheme of things without giving it a fair try.

The age of a person was a crucial factor in comprehensive implementation. Putting all pupils into one school did not change the basic structures of secondary schools for a long time - if at all, in some cases. A long-held belief in Scottish education is that children of different abilities just do not mix. Even on school trips kids sorted themselves out into friendship groups based on ability. Comprehensive protagonists misled and overemphasised the social engineering side of their case. By willing it to happen, they believed it actually was happening. The merits of the social arguments were pushed beyond their credible limits.

16. a) The way schools continued to group pupils by ability in all year
+
b) groups showed that they were not the great social engineering fulcrums politicians had assumed they would be. So when the dream did not materialise, politicians began to intervene more because schools had failed to go far enough. It was never thought that perhaps schools had taken a wrong turning. Rather, the view was they had not become comprehensive enough. The feeling was that heads and their staffs had failed to deliver by the mid 1970's, so questions began to be asked. Inquiries were set up. Ideas which had originated among left-wing gurus of socialism in England had not worked in Scottish schools, many of which were seen to have erred on the social side and neglected the educational.
17. Yes, curricula and methods did change but not solely because of comprehensive education. Schools are inevitably affected by society and its demands. Social change over the last 20 years

has been so extensive that there would have been changes anyway.

18. Comprehensive education shook a lot of people out of their old ways, but have we totalled up the full price? World War 2 was said to bring many improvements, but a lot of Jews and soldiers died. A massive change occurred yes, but possibly academic vigour, and discipline have given way to a more casual outlook. Maybe it's bound up with society too. It would be interesting to research into the casualties of comprehensive education.
19. Comprehensive education caused an urban revolution, but hardly a gust of wind in Aberfeldy. It changed the whole attitude to educational provision in urban areas. Maybe it's nostalgia, but I'm not sure if all pupils gained as they were supposed to. Housing policy in a large city area determines so much that education is powerless to change. Factors like unemployment have also dramatically caused the attractiveness of education to decline.
20. Equality of opportunity was seen largely only by parents as having any real meaning. Staff in schools were sceptical about claims made for it. It stopped splitting families as all children went to the same secondary school. It was a slogan which either masked differences in ability among pupils or made them more socially acceptable. Whatever else it achieved, it certainly did not assist schools in bringing out the best in all pupils, irrespective of ability. Most people saw it as an opportunity for more pupils to sit Ordinary grades.

21. The only meaningful way to look at a comprehensive school is in terms of its geographical area, and you then get down to catering for the different abilities within it. I am wary of the sociological lobby who emphasise the social mixing arguments. Part of the problem is that the term was never defined, so it can mean all things to all men.

22. No, the potential of the comprehensive school has not been realised. There was something inherent in the beast which made it difficult if not impossible to fulfil any potential it had. The question that should be faced is: what is it that we are trying to tap? We still have miles to go in the enormously difficult task of giving all kids a sense of worth and fulfilment. The educational zealots have made the running for too long. I fear the politicians are increasingly going to decide what is to happen in schools.

One final thought: how good a school, any school, comprehensive or not, is, depends on the quality of minds and attitudes of its head and staff. The more open-minded real professionals you have the better. It's all about the ratio of open to closed minds.

1. The main initiatives for comprehensive education came from:
 - the Educational Institute of Scotland, nationally rather than locally.
 - Scottish Association of Labour Teachers, which acted as a pressure group with a limited membership and a limited influence.
 - Campaign for the Advancement of State Education a multi interest group which was broadly based and took an interest in most matters educational.
 - an important influence was also the work of English academics, like Vaizey and Simon, who became known from the late 1950's.

2. Most of the agitation for comprehensive education went on in England. There were hardly any feelings of injustice up here. Maybe the Scots were a bit naive. We only realised much later how much the English educational system was organised on class lines. The English were totally obsessed with the 11+ and its effects. Up here, the boundaries between senior secondary and junior secondary schools were much more flexibly drawn. When I started teaching in ----- High School in 1958, it was not unlike the present comprehensive school, except that modified or junior secondary 2 pupils were housed separately. The junior secondary 1 pupils were in the same building. There was no emotional spasm over selection procedures in Scotland. Many people just were not aware of what was happening in England. For most people, the status quo in Scotland did not seem unreasonable. The thing which frustrated people about the

Scottish set up was its virtually total rigidity. You were either junior secondary/senior secondary. It was impossible, or almost, to move. I would say, all in all, that most interested people saw the introduction of comprehensive education as a political move to end the perpetuation of class distinctions intensified through the educational system.

3. The 1947 Report did exercise some influence. It was seized on by the Nationalists and acted as a brake on local authorities not to go for the common school, which was seen as an English phenomenon. The qualifying exam was liberally interpreted here, and there was no rationing of senior secondary places. Every pupil got his/her chance in whatever stream/course they had been allocated a place. The 1947 Report was not widely discussed. One of the things that was discussed was the finding of recruits to the armed forces that many pupils' abilities had been seriously underestimated. This got people thinking that perhaps our selection procedures had not always got it right.

4. We had had 13 years of a Conservative government. They were running out of ideas and were targets for attack from all quarters. As a rule, they were satisfied with the education system as it was, and were unwilling to change it on the basis of unproven egalitarian theories. It was very much a case of 'YOU'VE NEVER HAD IT SO GOOD'. In any case, for a lot of Scots a common reaction was that we had always had comprehensive schools up here anyway, so what was all the fuss about?

5. I went to ----- as principal teacher Geography in 1965.

Glasgow had moved towards a comprehensive arrangement of secondary schools long before Circular 600. ----- was a four year school from which able children transferred to ----- at the end of secondary 2. Those who stayed did Ordinary grades. There was some resentment at this, but at the same time a recognition that the school's status had gone up a few rungs by being made a 4 year school. The job satisfaction for staff was much higher. Glasgow had anticipated Circular 600, although I would hesitate to say just how far ahead they had planned. They had set up experimental comprehensive schools in the new housing estates in the 1950's.

When I went to ----- in 1969 when ----- closed, it was a huge school and virtually a senior secondary school. All junior secondary pupils were in annexes and the senior secondary pupils were housed in the main building. Many teachers, especially principal teachers took the changed situation very badly. There was very little attempt made to cater for low ability pupils and this resulted in discipline problems. The opposition to comprehensive education was ideological not overt, although a true story is told of a principal teacher in a school which shall be nameless who produced an aerosol air spray every time former junior secondary pupils came into his room!

6. a) I was not aware of Her Majesty's Inspectors as an instrument of educational change. I hardly saw them except in rigidly formal situations. My impression was that as a group they themselves were pretty traditional, certainly not innovators.
- b) Local politicians then were much less assertive in educational matters than today. They were very sincere, with their hearts in

the right place. They had a committed if naive belief in education as a solution to all society's problems, as a way of enabling ordinary working class pupils to make it to university. They respected and were deferential to the Directorate, especially Dr. Mackintosh, who had a vast influence on his Committee.

- d) The Directorate was educationally committed to comprehensive education. The transformation took place within an atmosphere of general consent. No copious tears were shed at the demise of junior secondary schools! The move was seen as a good thing, even overdue, a step into the brave new world. Nevertheless, some of the pioneering headteachers appointed to new comprehensive schools (Macrae, Gardner, Christie) were seen by many colleagues as impractical visionaries and idealists.
- e) Advisers were seen as a shoulder to cry on, especially for those who had had an exclusively senior secondary career. Their principal function was to enable teachers to cope with a completely new set up. It was easy for advisers in one respect: money was poured into schools like nobody's business. There seemed to be no budget ceilings. You got literally what you wanted.
- f) The Consultative Committee on the Curriculum did contribute to developments, although the quality and influence of its curriculum papers varied enormously. I think it helped to maintain a strong sense of subject identity in schools. All hints of integration were vigorously resisted.

7. The main implication was on the internal organisation of the school, although buildings and accommodation proved troublesome in some places. The main obstacle was attitudinal: the retention of academic or elitist notions and practices. The full benefits of comprehensive education were not made available for many years. As late as 1977, as deputy head teacher, I had a job trying to change that school from a strictly streamed secondary 1 with promotion/relegation twice a year decided by exam results. Since there was no comprehensive curriculum or exam structure, a concealed academicism was very much the order of the day. It was only with raising of the school leaving age and the Green Paper that the ice age began to crack visibly, and people began to talk of courses rather than subjects. The Macaulay Report in Glasgow was a great step forward, even though its ICA recommendations were regarded as horrendous.
9. Everything that happened in a school depended on the headteacher and his philosophy. They dictated what happened. As long as they ran a tight ship, with good discipline and good Scottish Certificate of Education results, no one interfered.
10. There was no ferment of public opinion, as far as I know, about the theory of comprehensive education among parents. It was only if it was seen to affect their school/children adversely that any row occurred.
11. a) Short of bussing, you are always going to have housing estate schools. You just have to live with them and do your best. If anything, a lot of streaming by ability went on in schools like

that out of a genuine belief that it would rescue the able from their unfortunate background.

b) In a democratic society, private schools should exist even if they torpedo socialist principles. Schools, in my view, should not be used for social engineering - this would only cause alienation. In any case, there are so few private schools in the West of Scotland that their effects are negligible.

12. Within schools, there was very little change until the full effects of raising of the school leaving age were felt around 1973-4. That single event concentrated the mind wonderfully. It alone caused some people to begin to think about ending the separatism in schools.

13. Without question in-service training generated an enormous amount of work, much of it dissipated. There was a great deal of enthusiasm on the part of some teachers, even though some of their products were amateurish. They did provide a good back up for the teachers struggling back in the schools. Very little follow up was done, but it, at the very least, helped the people who participated.

14. For headteachers, it was a function of age. It was no accident that appointments began to be made at a much younger age. I remember the local furore when a head teacher was appointed in 1968 aged 47! It's all changed now, of course. Headteachers are servants of the authority since Regionalisation. Councillors create policy. The Education Convener is a very prestigious position, principal teachers, especially in certain subjects had

great difficulty in adapting - maths, modern languages, classics. Also, subjects like Technical and Home Economics got an upgrading in status. In general, teachers accommodated themselves to the system, mucked in as best they could. In the most enthusiastic and committed, there was a realisation that their function went beyond the narrowly academic.

16. The curriculum was affected enormously. Rigid allocation to courses gradually died a death. Pupils were exposed to a wider range of subjects. Kids were given chances if they wanted to take them. Also, the sex differential in subjects has gone for good in certain subjects like Technical and Home Economics. Methods sadly lagged far behind the curricular changes. Much depended on the subject - Maths and Modern Languages were notorious last bastions of the old guard. There has been a gradual and patchy move towards a more child - centred approach.
19. The move to a comprehensive system was a massive change in Scotland, even though much less radical than in England. Our system was much more traditional than many people liked to believe. The Scottish omnibus school was arranged on the Platonic myth of the metals. The widening of opportunities implied in the comprehensive school caught Scottish educationists on the hop.
20. Initially, equality of opportunity was seen as extending to all the possibility of doing Scottish Certificate of Education exams - denying no one the opportunity. Only gradually - after 20 years! - did a different philosophy emerge - Standard grade.

21. Parents saw comprehensive schools as vehicles for getting their kids better jobs and a better life than they had had. There was no attachment to high sounding, educational or social theories, rather a basic, instrumental/utilitarian outlook.
22. Outside factors - political and social - have dealt various blows to the comprehensive ideal. The decline in jobs had led to an alienation among many young people, and calls into question the whole compulsory nature of education. TVEI and Standard grade are on the right lines.

1. The source of initiatives was political, but not entirely. There was widespread acceptance of the junior secondary/senior secondary set up, and the Director was quite content with things as they were. As long as there were no complaints about or from the school, you were left entirely alone. The atmosphere between the Director and schools was not pleasant. You were isolated. He rarely visited the school, and when he did, stayed only a few minutes. He appeared uninterested in what you were doing. When we were taken over at Regionalisation, you sensed immediately a greater interest and eagerness to help. As a junior secondary school we had abysmal staffing problems, and just guddled through as best we could. Gradually the educational arguments for comprehensive education became stronger, but I was not aware of pressure from parents. My staff was very much in favour of the upgrading to a 4 year school.
2. The moves were a fusion of the educational and political. It was becoming apparent that several children who had been labelled junior secondary at 11/12 had Ordinary grade potential. Selection at 12 was not always accurate. Junior secondary pupils were denied the opportunity to do Ordinary grade, even in Technical, Food and Nutrition or Business Studies. They had no official outlet for these abilities, even if they were not good at academic subjects, and so were denied the better jobs.
3. I think the 1947 Report was useful in that it started people off questioning the adequacy of the educational system, but it did

not cause a stir.

4. The 1960's was a period of change in all sorts of things, and education was no exception. It was a lively period. Industry was looking for well-educated and well-trained youngsters taught to their potential. There was a feeling of a need to do more for those pupils formerly excluded from Scottish Certificate of Education exams. It was the technological age, one of hope and full employment.
6. The Consultative Committee on the Curriculum published its reports but, in general, I do not think it had much impact on what happened. Education officials and advisers were helpful, more so in Dumbarton than in Lanarkshire. Labour Councillors were all for it, and so had Her Majesty's Inspectors to be. They came with ideas for change, but were obviously unaware of the practical difficulties of running a school. They were far too unrealistic in their expectations.
7. In a school which was upgraded there were hardly any obstacles. Staff and pupils got a great boost. The only thing was that some parents were doubtful if a school that had formerly been junior secondary would be able to give their children as good an education as the established senior secondary schools. There was apprehension that choices and chances would not be as good.
9. I had total latitude to do as I liked. The only control on me was financial.

10. In general they reacted well. Formerly pupils had had no incentive. They just plodded on, and left at 15. With the realisation of the chance to sit Ordinary grades, there was a dramatic change of mood in staff and pupils. The trauma of division at 12 was over, and the morale of a condemned school was considerably lifted.
11. Neither fee-paying schools nor area schools in large housing estates was an obstacle to comprehensive education, since the most important determining factor in a child's success at school is the attitude of his parents to formal education. Social background is not as important as all that.
12. Circular 600 did not mean a thing. Headteachers were left to decide what they thought was appropriate, and work out courses with the staff they had. How the Circular was implemented rested with the headteacher and his educational views. These determined how much change took place within schools. In some, hardly any did.
13. I pushed my staff to have a go with in-service training. Guidance was a whole new concept. Also, some of my staff had to go to courses on Ordinary and Higher classes because it was new for them.
- Reports from staff on courses were generally favourable. The most frequent criticism was that some courses were too 'airy-fairy', and never got down to the practicalities of the classroom.

14. a) Headteachers never wrote down their objections. Those in posh senior secondary schools hardly changed a thing, and poorer pupils never got a fair deal there. They were always dwarfed by the brighter ones.
- b) My staff reacted well. In general, I would say that most staff did not favour the common course and mixed-ability classes, and that most favoured early grouping by ability to protect the interests of the high flyers.
15. The extent to which practical and academic children were integrated in school depended entirely on the school, and the headteachers will to have an honest attempt at comprehensive education. The variation in that will was enormous.
16. In my school, I kept mixed-ability throughout secondary 1 and secondary 2 and in secondary 3/4 we had three streams - definitely certificate, possibly certificate and definitely non-certificate. In general, we bent over backwards to give as many pupils a chance of Ordinary grade as possible.
17. a) The curriculum changed markedly, becoming more modern, more relevant.
- b) Teachers who experimented with methods were in a minority. Mixed-ability was a disaster, and hated by most teachers.
18. I think we had the best of it, going from junior secondary to senior secondary. It was a complete turnaround for some of my staff. Schools which moved the other way, absorbing junior

secondary pupils, hated the changeover, although it should have been a huge professional challenge for them. Willy-nilly, teachers were forced to change to some extent.

19. The comprehensive school was a modern idea. The Scottish tradition had been to separate children according to ability, even in burgh schools. There were - and probably still are - many schools which are comprehensive in name only.
20. Scottish interpretations of equality of opportunity were heavily influenced by the lad o'pairts tradition - giving every chance to any child who showed promise of having any academic ability. An amazing number of kids labelled failures at 12 went on to gain Scottish Certificate of Education passes and go to University.
21. a) A comprehensive school tries to find the strengths of its pupils and develop these as far as possible. It should aim to let as many sit Scottish Certificate of Education exams as want to, even if only in one subject.
22. The comprehensive school has not achieved its potential. Noble educational aims and good ideas are always in the end subservient to the realities of a school and its surrounding society. Lack of money and prevailing attitudes of the teaching staff together with the scramble for Ordinary and Higher passes have caused the comprehensive movement to lose sight of its aims.

1. When I was headteacher of a junior secondary school in ----- it lived in the shadow of the ultra-selective senior secondary school in the town. It took the top 20% of pupils leaving 'the dross' to us. I felt that this arbitrary percentage was illogical, and did not stand up to the laws of reason. An element of aspiration in the community is important for a school. The junior secondary pupils had a limited range of aspirations, and had been conditioned to accept low horizons. They never thought they were any better than taking a technical apprenticeship, or a course at ----- Technical College. Anyway, I developed a small 'academic' top group who blossomed, and went on to ----- Academy. My aim was to afford opportunity to those pupils who had never thought of tackling such work. There was nothing ideological in my motivation. When I came to ----- I was struck by how much it was organised as a multilateral school, with rigid boundaries between different ability groups. Quite arbitrary decisions were taken about pupil potential. I did the same thing - created two classes of pupils who were classed as leavers, but to whom I gave the opportunity of staying on. I encountered a lot of scepticism among the old senior secondary staff. Because the pupils were literate and articulate, they were suited to the exam system. For two years results were consistently good. I was convinced, thereafter, that the pool of ability was far greater than a lot of people in education imagined. So my personal approach was pragmatic and empirical, based on a feeling that the system was not offering equality of opportunity. Other people were beginning to realise

this, but not many headteachers. As a headteacher at 37, I was regarded as an eccentric with odd ideas anyway. So there was an educational and a social dimension - getting pupils qualifications and making more of them feel of some worth in the school. I was most struck by what one pupil, said to me one day: 'Sir before you came, I never got a chance to fail an exam'. Of course, the idea was fine, but the corollary was not so easy to achieve - adjusting content, method and modifying aims to suit a broader range of pupils.

2. It would be easy to say that the moves to introduce the comprehensive school were political, but that would not be altogether fair. The political element was inevitable - major change in education needs that. But, I think the aim was honourable - to provide educational opportunity on a fairer basis than hitherto.
3. The 1947 Report probably influenced thinking in a broad way, but it provided no detailed suggestions on implications.
4. The 1960's was a period of expansion, in which resources were available. It was the 'swinging sixties', pop culture encouraged people to do their own thing. The mood in society was anti-categorisation. We were all to be our own person. Schools were part of this. It seemed to me that in such an atmosphere, schools could not but be affected, if they were to avoid being labelled education factories.
6. a) Her Majesty's Inspectors were preachers of the gospel, who were

supposed to stimulate developments in the schools. A good number of them were not 100% of the faith, and had reservations about what they were advocating in public.

- b) Local politicians were inclined to favour it to please parents' aspirations for their children. It was a bit of a vote-catcher for them.
 - c) Education officials went through the administrative motions, but did not push it. You were left to your own devices as long as what you were doing did not cause uproar in the community.
 - d) Advisers were a mixed bunch. Some were keen, and had a good concept of their function - to encourage developments in schools. Others were less enthusiastic.
 - e) Officialdom - the Consultative Committee on the Curriculum - was not organised for the change. A lot of teachers who emerged as knowing something about comprehensive schools were largely self-taught as a result of their enthusiasm.
7. The main obstacle to comprehensive education was attempting to eliminate the folk memory of separation by ability. The notion of giving all pupils a chance to see what they could do was a radical departure in Scotland. There was a lot of hostility, scepticism and cynicism from many staff. Eventually, most came to accept it, and some even admitted that the atmosphere was better in school as a consequence.
9. I had total latitude. I was just left to do my own thing. No crisis was provoked in my school, so the Directorate was happy.

The amount of staff commitment to comprehensive education was variable but as long as Scottish Certificate of Education results kept coming, everyone seemed happy enough.

10. Parents weren't too bothered, as long as the new philosophy didn't harm the chances of able kids.
11. With the existence of private schools, a lot of able children did not go to state schools. But would state schools have been any better as a result? What is a good school? There is a lot of ideological nonsense talked in the Private/State School debate. I do not think that the absence of private school pupils detracted from our ability to give our pupils opportunities to match their abilities.
12. The Circulars 600 and 614 gave the official impetus for a change of ideas which occurred gradually and with varying degrees of uptake thereafter.
13. In-service training and Teachers' Centres played an important part in comprehensive developments, but it is difficult to quantify. Was the return worth all the effort? I would say that, on balance, more teachers benefited than didn't, and a fair number made some modifications to what they did as a result.
14. a) Feelings got better as the older heads retired. Some had no real belief in it, but did their best. In general, younger heads were more receptive to the new ideas.
b) Initially, the feeling was very much - 'it'll not work'. Very

gradually, it got better, and many realised it wasn't so bad. But streaming was fixed in the minds of many for a long time.

15. I went out on a limb on this one, and set out deliberately to blur the categories, but in some schools it was all pupils under one roof, but neatly packaged into groups based on ability.
16. a) Some gave mixed-ability a go, but it was a long time before aims, content and methods resolved themselves satisfactorily. Those who were against it were so out of fear of the unknown. A very small minority did nothing at all.
- b) Secondary 3/secondary 4 tended to be split, but by pupil choice. Classes also tended to be set within subjects.
17. Yes, but the comprehensive school was only one factor which affected the curriculum and teaching methods.
19. I think you have to be careful with the Knoxian vision in Scottish education. His system was conceived on a small scale. Education was not compulsory, only the provision of schools was. So the number of lads o'pairts was much smaller than is often imagined, as scrutiny of old parish records shows. Post 1914, there began to be heard cries for secondary education for all. I would say that comprehensive education was a radical response to the compartmentalisation which occurred in Scottish education in the inter-war years, with senior secondary schools and junior secondary schools/advanced divisions. After the Second World War, there was hope of a brighter future. Soldiers returning

from the war wanted the best for their children, and did not like the ossified education system which labelled children as successes or failures at 12. Gradually, educationists and sociologists began to amass evidence of errors in selection procedures.

20. Equality of opportunity was seen traditionally in terms of lads o' pairs. There were individual lad's o'pairs, but their number is difficult to trace. It has certainly been exaggerated. The educational system did not automatically throw them out. In the 18th and 19th centuries, there were social, economic and personal factors which intervened. I would say that equality of opportunity existed in the sense that if you could overcome all the other obstacles, you got a chance if you had ability.
21. - basic to the notion of a comprehensive school is that all the children from its catchment area are equal subjects before the law. Opportunities are open to all, but are taken in different ways by different individuals.
- the curriculum, methods and assessment must be adjusted to cater for the diversity in abilities.
- without indulging in social engineering, children must be bound together into a community, even though they separate themselves out in terms of subjects etc.
22. No, the potential of the comprehensive school has not been exploited chiefly because, the more you think about it, the more you realise how difficult and highly complex an undertaking it is. To get a group of professional teachers pulling in the same

direction, committed to realising the aims of the common school in terms of curriculum, assessment etc., so that it will be seen to offer the best chances for all - is quite an undertaking. It's the Platonic idea of organising the community by letting the community make choices. Also, the comprehensive school has suffered from the world outside. Its products are judged and found to be wanting. So a change is made. They suddenly want B but forgot that a few years ago they had asked for A. It's a complex sophisticated piece of professionalism. Extraneous factors like finance, policy etc., are important, but their impact can be blunted, provided the ethos and aims of the staff are attuned to a comprehensive approach.

When I went to ----- High School it was still a senior secondary school in a town which had three junior secondary schools. There was no Roman Catholic senior secondary school at that time. One junior secondary school was disbanded, another amalgamated with ----- High, and ----- was upgraded. ----- junior secondary Roman Catholic school was also upgraded.

A major problem about comprehensive reorganisation was that a lot of schools were in the wrong places. I was known as an advocate of the comprehensive school. As early as 1953 I gave a lecture on the subject to The British Association in Edinburgh, in which I tried to point up the horrible failure of junior secondary schools. The vast majority were dead-end dives. Most large secondary schools in the 1950's and early 1960's were multilateral schools, in which the main attention was paid to the senior secondary side, and the others were merely adjuncts which were tolerated.

Another problem in the introduction of comprehensive education was that many headteachers acted like benevolent despots - with plenty of power, but with no sense of responsibility. (Nowadays, I feel the tables have been turned, and heads have massive responsibilities with very little power). As headteachers, we were given broad general directives, but had enormous power to do what we wanted within broad guidelines. In fact, the Director said to me shortly after my appointment: YOU KNOW ALL ABOUT COMPREHENSIVE EDUCATION; GET INTO CLYDEBANK AND SHOW US HOW TO DO IT. With that kind of approach, it is no wonder that the introduction and development of comprehensive education was botched up.

Its introduction was, of course, political. Junior secondary schools, teachers and pupils were very much regarded as second class, and as such professional expectations were limited from the outset. In senior secondary schools, those who were appointed to posts of headteacher and principal teacher were too fond of the professional rewards that working there brought, and the inevitable result was educational stagnation. It was a curious thing: the junior secondary/senior secondary set up was structurally bad, socially, educationally and psychologically, and yet there was no widespread conviction amongst teachers that junior secondary schools should be abolished. Comprehensive schools were resented because they created an obstacle on the academic route, so people in positions of power erected all sorts of subtle barriers so that, as a concept, comprehensive education was never taken seriously nor given a fair crack of the whip. The general view, I would say, was that efforts should be directed to mitigating its worst effects, when it was realised that it would not go away.

My own view was that here was a golden opportunity to raise the standard of education for children who had formerly gone to junior secondary schools. While still catering for the most able as before - in other words, do the best possible for everybody. I fear that many people in secondary schools were overconcerned to see that no harm came to the bright kids, so that the other inevitably suffered. Especially where schools amalgamated to form a new comprehensive school, the hostility to the new system was most marked. It was a real mess, and the new schools were born into a most uncongenial environment indeed. Vested interests began to assert themselves, and much lip-service began to be paid to the new scheme. Many headteachers drove a coach and horses through new ideas like the common course and mixed-ability teaching by streaming and

setting, or very thinly disguising the latter as broad-banding. As far as Directorate staff was concerned, heads had to get on and make it 'work'. Not surprisingly, what emerged were 'comprehensive' schools which were really multilateral schools, with the old senior secondary and junior secondary streams being identified and separated at various stages of earliness.

To really have a go at making a comprehensive school work, I had to demolish a few cherished notions e.g. principal teachers taking only secondary 4, secondary 5, secondary 6 certificate classes, introduce different teaching methods. Comprehensive education I saw as an on-going process or re-education for the staff. The reality was that many shunned change, and continued with the well-tried methods.

Another target was the venerated twice-yearly exams. I gradually abandoned them, and instituted a system of continuous assessment from secondary 1 - secondary 4. Many staff are thirled to examinations, some kids even like them, but they are a formidable barrier to education.

Corporal punishment was another thing that had to go.

Looking back on it all, I am not as convinced as I was that it was a good idea. Socially it was, but educationally no. Comprehensive education ought to mean educating every child to its full potential, but I feel that politicians put such a straitjacket on the system, that people felt compelled to push all children through the system at the same speed. After an undifferentiated start children should find their own level in subjects of their choice, and be given valid educational experiences at that level.

Parents and teachers were in the main hostile to comprehensive education, the former because its arrival was seen as making good schools inferior to what they had been 'in the old days, and the latter because, in their own words, 'we're getting all the rubbish of the day to teach now!' The political/social side of the innovation dominated the educational side, to its detriment, in my considered opinion.

Guidance was supposed to maximise pastoral care and mitigate the worst effects of size. I have mixed feelings about it now. It was a good idea, which again fell down in practice, just like the Green Paper posts. So many bad appointments were made in both, and, as you know, once incompetent people get into promoted posts in education, there is virtually nothing that can be done to get them out. The system had more than its fair share of 'balloons', and 'yes-men' who earned a lot for doing nothing. The result was sterility and stagnation.

Also increased teacher militancy torpedoed any hope of running schools democratically, even if headteachers had wanted to - not many I knew did. Some were fascist pigs! A large majority of teachers did not want to know about schools as mechanisms for integrating their pupils with common aims etc. Rather the emphasis was on separation into groups based on ability. Perhaps it is fair to say that purpose-built comprehensive schools in brand-new buildings had a golden opportunity to make it work, but even here it was difficult to eradicate old ideas. So much depended on staff attitudes and the educational philosophy of the headteacher. Very little practical help was given, either by the Directorate or Her Majesty's Inspectors - in fact they were hanging around waiting to pick up ideas from schools. Advisers were a mixed-bunch: some were very go-ahead, and keen to promote new developments.

Others were dreadful, either because of their own academic outlook, or because they got bogged-down in office routine.

So comprehensive schools in the West of Scotland have not been a success in the main. From the outset, they have been hidebound by politics in all its forms. The real meaning and implications of the move to a comprehensive system were never tackled or properly prepared for. Instead a new idea was grafted on to a former highly elitist system, and the graft never took. The new imposed system was rejected either overtly or subtly. Heads and principal teachers were chiefly interested in and got most satisfaction from the academically able. Staff were dragged unwillingly into it, and many moved only when forced. Buildings in some cases did not help, but the real root cause of the lack of success has been that only a small, enthusiastic minority of teachers has been prepared to re-educate itself to a truly comprehensive philosophy. The strangle-hold of old academic approaches has meant a very poor deal educationally for children who were not academically inclined. They were left to rot, or get on as best they could.

To finish, here is my definition of a comprehensive school:

The truly comprehensive school is a neighbourhood school that takes in EVERYBODY in its catchment area regardless of race, religion ability or social standing, and then 'educates' its pupils, developing them to the limit of their capacity, developing their own peculiar and special talents (after discovering them!) and developing them socially, psychologically and physically, widening their horizons in culture and leisure pursuits. Thus it needs to be well-staffed and VERY WELL equipped and to have a philosophy that learning ANYTHING can be enjoyable, and that learning is NOT a nine-till-four Monday-to-Friday

activity. Above all, it needs to be a DEMOCRACY, not a DICTATORSHIP, in which ALL PEOPLE, and all areas of learning, are regarded as valuable.

There was no impetus from within the profession for a change to comprehensive education. The movement was a national political one, which met various local responses. Glasgow seemed a pioneering and progressive authority. It picked good, politically committed and active headteachers for its founding comprehensive schools in the new post-war housing estates. The establishment of these schools had a big effect. They became good examples. But even these innovative schools still stuck to old practices like streaming, teachers with academic gowns, top classes, prize givings etc. They perpetuated old familiar habits. Perhaps it was explained by the fact that, since these schools were seen as experimental, they had to prove they 'worked'.

Her Majesty's Inspectors were interested, and education officials were concerned. Advisers were not much involved to start with, but became much more so later. The general approach of the Directorate was to deal with the administrative/financial aspects of the change, and leave committees/working parties of headteachers to look at the school-based problems, and produce reports. The officials were involved, but at several steps removed from schools. A lot was put on and expected of headteachers and their staffs. The authority was concerned primarily with the outward structure of comprehensive education, rather than with what implications it had for the internal workings of schools. As a result, most schools had the structure for comprehensive education, but only a minority understood it in educational terms. Very few staff at all levels understood what was happening - whether because they were unable or unwilling is hard to say. In my opinion, comprehensive education as envisaged in Circular 600 was set back as much as ten years

because thinking did not progress beyond the structure. The thing simply was not thought through. There was no real understanding of what was involved. A small minority of heads was in the vanguard of change. They were energetic and wanted to make it work. On balance, the rest were either hostile or cynical, because they saw its introduction as forcibly imposed from outside. A comparison with how Standard grade was introduced will show how far we have come: organisation and planning are more careful, and more thought has been given to philosophy and materials. So I would say that encouraging noises and nodding agreement were given to comprehensive education, but there was no real action for a long time.

The single biggest obstacle to its successful introduction was staff attitudes - by a long way! People in 1965/6 were comfortable and secure in a system run principally for academic pupils. Suddenly, the cosy picture was disturbed by the intrusion on the scene of non-academic pupils on a scale never before experienced. People were not prepared or did not receive any in-service training for this fait accompli, this bolt from the blue. Parents too received a shock: respected local institutions (senior secondary schools), symbols of discipline, learning and success in Scottish Certificate of Education exams suffered a change of image. Comprehensive education was seen as lowering standards and having an adverse effect on 'good' schools.

Local authority attempts to provide courses for non-certificate pupils were well-intentioned but not really successful, with a few notable exceptions. They had to fight against the 'BETTER TRY ORDINARY GRADE AND GIVE THEM A CHANCE' philosophy, which was very prevalent. But many pupils were not suited to the demands of a certificate course.

Authorities never adopted a gun-at-the-head approach to internal change in schools. It was always gentle pressure or encouragement. No one ever said: 'THIS IS WHAT WE WANT YOU TO DO'. No instructions were given. But attitudes in this regard changed around the mid - 1970's.

I think that both private schools and area schools in housing estates have had an adverse effect on proper comprehensive developments. As placing requests under the Parent's Charter have shown, there are such things as 'magnet' schools. It is ironic that we in ----- are now more comprehensive than schools in Drumchapel. What has always been important is the image of a school as it is perceived by the local community.

Internal changes in schools were slow. Those schools that did change their practices were seen to be taking bold, even risky steps. As a result, I am not sure if the majority of teachers saw comprehensive education as a reform, something which would better schools. In education we have a knack of getting things wrong: we make major changes, and then just let the system absorb them - let it all happen, so to speak, leave it to the schools.

In-service training and Teachers' Centres promoted the cult of the so-called 'hero-innovator'. These were usually very good people who understood the principles of management and curriculum development. So I would say that change happened or it didn't in schools in proportion to the number of hero innovators on the staff. Development was very much personnel-linked. If they got promotion a whole development could collapse. In-service training had no overall plan, but depended on publicising examples of good practice.

A lot of headteachers were 'agin the government' on the matter of comprehensive education. The opposition was much more overt in the early days when established headteachers spoke out publicly and forcibly against it. Died-in-the-wool, senior secondary school traditionalists argued openly with Her Majesty's Inspectors, stating their refusal to co-operate. Such a stance towards change is much less in evidence nowadays. There is much more control and attention to accountability from Her Majesty's Inspectors and Directorate staff. Teachers, too, resisted the changeover, largely because they could not see the sense in breaking up a tried and proven system which had done well in terms of Scottish Certificate of Education results by generations of pupils. Eventually, of course, a second wave of heads and staff came along which had a better understanding of what was involved. Any opposition now is mixed, if it exists at all.

In my opinion the fusion of junior secondary/and senior secondary schools in the name of comprehensive education caused major and irrevocable changes, the effects of which, however, did not make themselves felt for several years. In Glasgow, it was the publication of the Macaulay Report which set people thinking. There would have been no major developments in secondary education without the creation of comprehensive schools. There was little change in teaching methods well into the 70's. There was a slow move away from didacticism, because teachers thought it was a good way. They felt secure in it. Many Scottish teachers are very good at formal whole class teaching.

I think comprehensive education has brought a much-needed informality into schools. In my school days in -----, I remember a very tight set up ----- senior secondary and 2 local junior secondary -----

and ----- . Everything (and everybody) was neatly sectioned off and labelled. People thought all pupils were well catered for by that system, but were they? To that extent, comprehensive education was a radical concept for the Scottish system.

A comprehensive school should have no ban on entry, and its aim should be to approximate as closely as possible to a teaching and learning programme tailored to meet the needs of all pupils. The individual is paramount in the comprehensive school, so the curriculum, methodology and assessment should be structured appropriately. The guidance system is crucial, since in my view, a comprehensive school should go to any lengths to help and care for its pupils. Academic progress is important, but only one aspect of the complete education which a comprehensive school should aim to offer, with things like social education, health education, environmental education and non-examinable courses. In a comprehensive school pupils should be given every consideration, in and out of the classroom.

1. Parents were behind the move as they hated children in the same family going to different schools.
2. The reasons were mainly educational.
3. The 1947 Report was helpful. It provided a reservoir of ideas.
4. Comprehensive schools were a sound workable idea that appealed to the ideas of people at that time.
5. The shift to comprehensive education caused me no problems, or very few, and these were all minor.
6. a) Her Majesty's Inspectors/Inspectorate kept standards up. They usually reinforced my ideas, or indicated any new ones they had found.
b) Councillors had no effect whatever.
c) Directorate people had no irons in the fire over comprehensive schools. They tried to be helpful if you asked for assistance. Otherwise they didn't bother you.
d) People took advisers or left them. Overall they had little effect.
e) The Consultative Committee on the Curriculum reports helped keep staff up to date, if they wanted to be.

7. The changeover went smoothly, with no obstacles that I can remember. The main concern I had was not to reduce the academic standards of the school to accommodate pupils who would previously have gone to junior secondary school. They were getting an opportunity to show if they could measure up to senior secondary school ways.
9. I had total latitude. I was never told what to do at any time.
10. Parents welcomed it, as I have said.
11. These schools had no effect whatever, and only affected a handful of pupils.
13. They helped staff to get used to new ideas, and let them discuss what they were doing.
14. a) Heads welcomed the change.

b) Teachers accepted it without reservation. They were pleased that late starters now had the same opportunities as their cleverer classmates.
16. a) Classes were grouped in register classes in secondary 1-3 which had been made up on the basis of general ability from primary school reports.

b) After secondary 4, principal teachers sorted them into ability groups according to strengths and weaknesses in each subject.

Mixed-ability was a bad idea from the start. All right in a small rural school, but where you have big city schools with enough pupils to stream by ability, you should do so.

17. a) I would say it had very little effect, except that classics and modern languages took a knock. If anything, all subjects became slightly more practical in their approach.
- b) Methods did not change, so standards were maintained. Normal class teaching survived.
18. No I don't think so. There were ample pupils of all abilities around in the new comprehensives, so there was very little fundamental change. Things went on much as before.
19. The comprehensive school fitted perfectly with the Scottish tradition of getting all pupils into one local school, and then sorting them out into ability groups.
20. Comprehensive schools brought greater equality of opportunity in that they provided a chance for those who would have gone to junior secondary schools to get Ordinary and Higher passes. With the introduction of guidance, housestaff helped to deal with parents and pupils' problems. They were public relations figures.
21. A comprehensive school accepts all children from an area and gives them the same academic opportunities.
22. No, the potential has not been fulfilled. Religious segregation,

staffing, and poor discipline have prevented this.

1. There was increasing unease in educational circles and among parents on the division of children that took place as a result of the 'quali', an exam which tested only one quality. Parents resented the division of families and the stigma attached to junior secondary schools.
2. There was an educational and political push. The existing format had been regarded as unsound for a long time. Some teachers felt guilty. Promotion from junior secondary to senior secondary was in theory possible, but rarely happened. Teachers who had experience of both systems were uneasy.
3. The 1947 Report was a key document which set the powder alight, and brought out issues. The powerful senior secondary schools opposed it and took up delaying action. There was also the expense factor. The Report contained major issues that officials did not want to address. Purpose built schools on the recommendations of the Report would have been fine. But trying to fit new ideas to old buildings was like opening a can of worms.
4. There was a growing awareness among parents of the inequality in educational provision. Education began to be seen as important. Schools became more approachable to the public. People became concerned about their children's progress.
5. The Circular gave the impetus to the change to comprehensive

education. It also caused consternation. Those staff who were interested felt unmitigated joy. Their ideas were getting recognition. It heralded a period of experimentation for them. But others were hidebound in old ways, and felt plunged in, and so showed no willingness and felt desperation. The orthodox group were dragged unwillingly into the new era.

6. a) Her Majesty's Inspectors were on the sidelines. They were wary observers. They gave only information, but became more directive once they themselves had learned about it. They were not pleased if you did not do what they said you should.
 - b) Councillors were supportive if you wanted to help. It depended on their politics.
 - c) Directorate staff gave you all you wanted. They were aware of difficulties of amalgamating schools.
 - d) Advisers were unrealistic in what they thought could be done, but helped with suggestions. They knew as little about it all as teachers.
 - e) The feeling about Consultative Committee on the Curriculum documents was in general that the troops on the classroom floor knew more than the generals in Edinburgh.
7. The main problems were:
- accommodation, with many split-site schools and annexes.
 - an outdated and inappropriate curriculum.
 - a new concept of timetabling was required.
 - academic content and approaches needed drastic revision.

8. Headteachers had to be sympathetic, if not, staff were fighting a real battle. Heads, principal teachers and timetables were all important.
9. Heads had total latitude, as long as you didn't bother the educational officials. School policy was decided by heads with principal teachers, with no outside interference.
10. Comprehensive education made parents interested in education. For once, all children were in one school. Poorer areas were behind the new idea, but middle-class areas viewed it with doubt and apprehension. The general public was confused about the possibility of equality of educational opportunity for all.
11. a) Area schools were no obstacle, but they had difficulties in getting a social mix. Much depended on parental attitudes.

b) There was minimal creaming of able pupils by selective schools, because there were not all that many of them in the West.
12. The whole format changed, and became much less rigid. The curriculum and the timetable changed. Management and guidance came in. It also ended the days of the headteacher as a dictator. It compelled authority to be delegated.
13. There were very good courses which spread the new gospel. It helped to spread difficulties. Older teachers didn't think. Those with an open mind were a bit more flexible.

Many new courses developed because there was a bigger spread of ability.

14. a) Most headteachers were frightened to death of the complexity. They were, in general, apprehensive. Their reaction was a function of how rigid their minds were. They were confused and had little confidence that what was being asked of them was possible. Most wanted things to stay as they were.
- b) Principal teachers in particular, and teachers in general, had difficulty in adjusting, but most gave it a good bash. Principal teachers were key people.
15. On the face of it, completely, but in reality, within the schools the former junior secondary/senior secondary pupil types were recognisable. Streaming allowed all abilities to be catered for.
16. Secondary 1/secondary 2 - Maths and English were streamed, and remedial groups were extracted. All other classes were in common course format. Pupils were mixed for practical and aesthetic subjects. Broad banding occurred in secondary 2, with some non-maths/non-language classes. Within bands, they were in streamed classes. Secondary 3/secondary 4 - certificate and non-certificate groups were formed. As many as wanted got a chance at Ordinary grades.
17. a) The curriculum had to become less academic, more practical and relevant.
- b) Teachers had to make tremendous changes in their methods and approaches with middle and bottom streams. Many teachers had to adapt because they had never seen pupils of that type before.

18. Many teachers were at first at a complete loss, especially staff who had only ever worked in senior secondary schools. Teachers required help in the reappraisal of their methods and approaches. They realised gradually that they had to be more flexible.
19. It agreed with the Scottish attitude towards equality of opportunity. Implicit was the assumption of equality of ability. Children are not equal. In the comprehensive school they all had an equal chance to the limit of their ability. Many people felt that it was more realistic to stretch pupils within their own ability limits.
20. A comprehensive school is one where all children attend the same school and get an equal opportunity to show what they can do, and achieve all they are capable of.
21. Children should be educated to the maximum of their ability as far as possible in subjects of their choice.
22. No, it has not been realised, because:
- society outside has changed. Schools are society in miniature
 - there is now a lack of concern about education
 - unemployment among the young
 - lack of finance and resources.

1. I think initiatives go back as far as the early 1950's.
2. It is difficult to separate the two, but I would say that the comprehensive movement was helped by those of a liberalist socialist point of view.
4. I don't know, but I assume it was because the idea of rigidly separating children at primary 7 into different types of secondary school did not appeal to the social thinking of the period. The philosophy that children were human beings with self-respect was dominant. Of course, much depends on the educational views of the Director of Education. In Glasgow, he was very much in favour of that sort of thinking.
5. Glasgow took up comprehensive schools quite easily. In some schools, it was developing quite naturally. Our local authority realised that having the headteacher in favour of comprehensive schools was a help, and made appointments accordingly.
6. 1) They were dragged along with the thinking, but my impression is that they did not exactly fall over themselves to push it.
2) The layman's point of view on matters education was often
+
5) confused. They got all their thoughts from the officials.
3) They just followed on and did not push it.
4) The Director of Education was a forceful character and carried them with him.

7. There was reluctance among some staff who didn't quite grasp or follow what it was all about. They were clever pupils themselves, brought up under an elitist system, and so regarded the idea that all pupils are equal with great cynicism. There were also old buildings, but the main problem was the hostility the idea met among teachers.
8. With persuasive teachers who got the staff to do what they thought was right, opinions gradually changed and some staff began to like the ideas behind the comprehensive movement. Gradually, momentum picked up as teachers got more involved in the new régime.
9. There was never any interference with my internal organisation in any school of which I was headmaster. There is a long tradition of leaving heads to it.
13. Pupils were graded within the school into classes which usually carried a letter. I did a bit of experimenting with mixed-ability classes, but a lot of teachers did not like that idea at all. Gradually, the least able pupils left so that by the time you got into the senior school it was only the brightest left.
15. I was not aware of them having any damaging effect. Most people felt that the changeover to comprehensive from senior secondary schools was more damaging. It was thought of as the end of an era.
16. I can't recall any public antipathy being expressed, but then

they didn't exactly go around blabbing their inner thoughts. Some liked the movement, which is best seen as a gradual process of changing ideas and practice in schools over a lengthy period of time.

17. To some extent, there was a continuation of old thinking, and pupils were separated into good, not so good and poor.
18. We tended to continue the old style of doing things - grouping into ability, based on primary reports. There was a traditional tendency to separate pupils into ability based on their early reactions to the subjects they got.
19. It opened up an era of experimentation. There was experimentation - mixed-ability and projects - but not much, as it usually met with hostility. The really keen experimenters were in the minority. The kids who were poor intellectually participated in extra-curricular activities, since they could not achieve much success in the classroom.
21. The ingrained tradition in Scotland is education for the best. There is also a tradition of general education for all, and it was thought that comprehensive education would strengthen this, but the dyed-in-the wool attitudes were still there.
22. One way was to provide social activities and extra-curricular opportunities for the backward pupils. Separations among children do not occur naturally, they are created by adults. The education the poorer children got in comprehensive schools was

not inferior, but in many ways superior to what they had got in junior secondary schools. For one thing they had the opportunity to sit national exams, if they had the ability. So I would say they gained quite a lot. They must be made to think they are important - this helps with their social development. I cannot think of any group of pupils that suffered in comprehensive schools.

23. A comprehensive school is a socially representative school which takes pupils of all abilities, and makes every effort to encourage the intellectually good without discouraging the poorer ones. The self-respect of the child must be preserved, because creating ideas of inferiority only sows the seeds of later trouble.
24. The ideas and drive must come from the headteacher. He must inspire faith in his staff to give all pupils a chance. He must give a good lead, and move the staff in the right direction, without making them feel pressurised.
25. I do not honestly know. You will never eliminate innate differences in ability. There will always be the the goodies and the baddies among the pupils - intellectually speaking. In my time, it was moving in the right direction of enabling each pupil to fulfil its potential and sit exams if it could. It was really a question of those who believed in it and tried to make it work e.g. headteachers, who were judiciously appointed. It was a gradual process of evolution over years - persuading, encouraging staff to have a go. No one would seriously suggest now that we

should go back to senior secondary/junior secondary separate schooling. People have been - and are still - working away trying to improve the comprehensive school and what goes on within it.

The Headteachers' Association of Scotland

It was a non-political association which had little influence. There were meetings and discussions about educational issues, but it was mostly an opportunity for social exchanges and comparing notes, a kind of 'we're all in it together' feeling. It was not deeply involved in philosophical matters, but rather on the practical issues of day-to-day administration of schools. It was a useful, business-like group of professional men.

1. As far as I recall, the initiatives in Glasgow were taken in the 1950's by Glasgow Corporation, when it decided to open St. Augustine's and Crookston Castle in 1954. The decision was politically motivated.
2. The moves to introduce comprehensive schools were educationally political - and an attempt to give a fairer deal to the whole range of ability. Some felt that junior secondary schools were dreadful, while others were convinced that junior secondary pupils got a very good deal there, better than they did in the comprehensive system. In general, senior secondary schools were against the move to comprehensivisation. I would say that part of it was that it seemed like commonsense at the time, given other factors like the school building programme. It was a method of rationalising provision.
4. The whole philosophy behind comprehensive education and its underlying aims had a very high profile in the 1960's. As I have said, it suited the building programme that was coming on stream. Apart from amalgamated senior secondary/junior secondary buildings, purpose-built provision in housing estates was already a reality in Glasgow. Feelings of unfairness at the junior secondary/senior secondary divide awakened educational concerns. So all children went to the same secondary school, but what happened inside the building was much the same as before. As a young teacher, I was not aware of any opportunities to discuss the educational implications of the political decision. The old

ideas and attitudes were simply transposed into new physical surroundings. It was only factors like Ordinary grade in 1962, and raising of the school leaving age ten years later that made any real impact, and forced people to take account of the educational implications.

5. I would say that Circular 600 caused some interest in the comprehensive model of secondary education, but it produced different conceptions of what exactly it meant. It ought to have meant a direct challenge to previous notions about prejudging pupils, and placing them in classes with a curriculum tailored to suit their perceived ability. In reality, not much changed for a good number of years. The real implications were not tackled till much later.
6. a) I had no dealings with Her Majesty's Inspectors at the time.
- b) Labour politicians were keen on the comprehensive idea, and even Conservative administrations did not impede or reverse the trend.
- c) I was not aware of Directorate staff issuing any statements about comprehensive schooling. The specific relevant curricular bits like syllabus changes came later. Schools were left very much to their own devices. In the early days, the Glasgow based Schools' Certificate provided a target for these pupils seen as less able. It was available at two levels, and was heavily biased towards the technical side for boys and the commercial for girls. But successful as these courses were, they were still perceived by staff and pupils to be for the bottom streams, and this caused discipline problems. Couple this with acute staff shortage and

the use of uncertificated teachers, and you can see that these pupils suffered under the so-called comprehensive system. They were seen as 'the dross'.

- d) Advisers were happiest when dealing with changes which affected the certificate side of the work - e.g. a new Scottish Certificate of Education exam. That was an area they were familiar with, and in which they could see clear goals. In my view, the advisers in Chapter 6 subjects had a far greater commitment and input than those in the academic subjects.
- e) Again, I was not aware of the Consultative Committee on the Curriculum in the 1960's. Their many bulletins and publications were looked at. They provided help, guidance and ideas for those who wanted them. Those which dealt with recognised subjects and their actual or eventual place in the curriculum pecking order had the greatest impact of them all. I still maintain that it was things like Ordinary grade, and its subsequent banding because of raising of the school leaving age that had the greatest relevance for teachers in schools - much greater than the thoughts of the Consultative Committee on the Curriculum.

7. The main obstacles to the implementation of a comprehensive policy of education in my opinion were:

- @teacher attitudes born of background, training and teaching experience.
- the total lack of any in-service or pre-service preparation for the realities of the comprehensive school. There were no real guidelines on 'mixed-ability grouping' or 'the common course' when they came along.

- the teaching/learning debate was never properly explored. We never really got down to the nitty-gritty in any organised way.
- materials (books mostly/were unsuitable). This led to the work-sheet takeover. In a sense, sheets have fed on themselves, and teachers are trapped in a sort of treadmill.

9. Headteachers were hardly ever subjected to monitoring in any pointed way. From time to time questionnaires were sent round to provide information of a statistical kind. In the matter of education, all you heard or saw was that the Education Committee had accepted that certain things should happen. There were never to my knowledge any black and white statements stating that things were compulsory. The Directorate staff and the Education Committee were concerned to present the 'right' public image, but never inquired too closely if what actually happened matched up to it.
10. I would say that, in general, parents were happy with the changeover to comprehensive education, which they saw as providing a better chance for everybody. I am not so sure how parents of the pupils in some of Glasgow's well-established senior secondaries - e.g. Eastbank, Whitehill, Hyndland - reacted. There may have been a feeling of a loss of image involved.
11. Area schools in housing estates were there whether people liked it or not, and the staff just got on with the job, sometimes in the face of incredible problems. The numbers involved in private

education were so small that they hardly affected the state comprehensives at all.

12. There has been a change in the approach to the curriculum, and a much greater appreciation of what is involved in comprehensive education. There was a gradual, very gradual breakdown in the old expository model of the class lesson based on books/chalk/talk followed by exercises, with pupils as passive recipients of 'knowledge'. There has also been a slow move from concern with content to concern with skills. I think teachers have absorbed the principles but are still lacking in-service training with the practicalities.
13. Much in-service training was about changes in content of either syllabus or examination. The main topic was content rather than pedagogy. Things like mixed-ability or non-certificate provision did not feature largely. Working parties of interested and committed teachers produced materials for the less able in secondary 1/2, and those in secondary 3/4 trapped by raising of the school leaving age. There was nothing like the amount of local or national back up that there should have been.
14. a) Headteachers in general react to change rather than promote it. Obviously therefore, they accentuate what they see as being its most important aspects, and this causes a wide variety of response.

b) Teacher reaction covered the whole spectrum from the fervently keen to the bitterly opposed, from those who welcomed working with and helping all abilities, to those who saw their job as

being exclusively to do with intellectual/academic children, unaffected by those of their fellows who were destined to become doers or artisans. Many teachers got caught up in the falling standards debate. In the absence of any help or guidelines from above, groups of teachers became reinforced in their own prejudices, and spoke to each other without mutual understanding.

19. Comprehensive schools started as separate schools in one building, and all would have been fine if they had perpetuated a firmly-tuned system of selective education. As long as the standards for the most able were not reduced, it did not matter that all children were in one building. But as soon as some theorists mentioned delaying selection, mixed-ability classes and provision for the less able, varying degrees of trauma set in. The John Knox ethic fitted in very well with most teachers' perceptions of a comprehensive school - we all get on the same bus but are destined to get off at different stops.

22. The comprehensive school has not had a fair go, and certainly has not reached its potential. I have no doubt that there has been a wide acceptance of the desirability of and sense behind the comprehensive principle. But, to use my earlier metaphor, the realities created by all being on the same bus - i.e. fair treatment in terms of teaching/learning for all - has not been fully explored. So people have been largely left to make their own response to dealing with a wide range of ability. The political stance has been: this is our policy but we would not dare tell the professional educators how to do it. The secondary 1/2 Report is a good example of this. The Regional Council is

seen to have investigated and pronounced upon an aspect of the education service. It looks good to outsiders but nobody really wants to turn over too many stones, in case too many slugs and worms crawl out from under them. There is, accordingly, a pretence that the reality is not happening, even though everyone knows it is. As for comprehensive education, I would say that there has been a dislocation between the recognition of a good educational principle and its translation into practice. Comprehensive education the concept was accepted as official policy, but thereafter the implementation was left to individuals and their ideas.

1. I think it went back as far as 1954 when Crookston Castle opened. At that time I was head of English in ----- Academy. I also taught previously in ----- Grammar School and ----- . It was in that last school that I became convinced that a comprehensive system of education was the only one that made sense.
2. Obviously the two were intertwined, but I'd say the balance lay in favour of the political. In tandem with that went feelings of disgust and shame among some teachers that the split between junior secondary and senior secondary school was too obvious, and carried with it dangers of misplacement and condemnation, even though transfer up was always said to be possible. The movement in Glasgow was helped greatly by having a socialist local administration, of which indeed there had been a long tradition.
3. I once participated in a broadcast on radio with Sir James Robertson in which he made a statement which I have never forgotten: IN MY LONG CAREER AS AN EDUCATIONIST, I HAVE NEVER BEEN WORRIED ABOUT WHAT WE DO TO OUR ABLE PUPILS, BUT I AM DEEPLY PERTURBED ABOUT THE TREATMENT OF THE AVERAGE AND THE LESS ABLE. The 1947 Report certainly influenced my thinking. I'd say it is still eminently quotable, but it is difficult to say if its influence was widespread. I would say that it definitely caused thinking on how to organise secondary education and concretised the thinking of those like myself who were having doubts about the segregated system. Another book I found personally stimulating was HEARTS NOT HEADS IN SCHOOL by A.S. Neill.

4. Apart from the educational injustice of the old system, the social injustice was also becoming clear. The viciously class-ridden society was being reflected in the educational system. In fact, both were mutually feeding each other. The enormity of the whole thing became apparent, so some of us took the view that instead of theorising about it all, it was high time to do something about it. Then, of course, it was a very materialistic society, with everyone conscious of opportunities, and wanting to get on and get a good job.
5. Circular 600 was influential because it was government policy and favourable to the comprehensive movement, because it definitely helped people to get a move on and think about the ideas in it.
6. 1) I was aware of a complete role change. Formerly Her Majesty's Inspectors were the tyrannical enemies of the teacher, abominations who caused many good teachers sleepless nights because of the inquisition they would have to face the next day. Suddenly, it acquired a human face. I think Forbes and Brunton were the men who achieved this. They supported comprehensive education, not just because it was policy, but because they themselves also happened to believe it was right. So they promoted it, supported teachers and even asked their advice - which would have been unheard of in earlier years. They were very good for the morale of those like myself who were trying to do something in schools.

2) They did not give me personally a great deal of support.

3) All of them were always extremely helpful to schools.

- 4) Outstandingly helpful. They capitalised on and exploited initiatives from anyone in schools willing to have a go.
- 5) They granted any request I made to them. You got anything they thought would advance the cause of comprehensive education. If it could be shown to advance my school in the direction I wanted it to go in I got it. They were particularly helpful in arranging visits for me and other headteachers. Their view of that was - 'take as long as you like if you think it'll help comprehensive education in Glasgow'. Some of these English heads were gurus in theorising and writing. The way their schools worked made me realise that the writings were understatements - they had arrived, but I was just starting!

A good example of how this worked has to do with the house system, which in my view is the corner-stone or ever foundation of a comprehensive school. Hamish Gardner and I went to London for about 10 days to study house systems in operation, and then Dr. Mackintosh allowed us to address the full Education Committee. Our view was that what we had seen proved that the system could bring an infusion of humanity into the large secondary school. The result? A decision was taken to introduce it experimentally into a few Glasgow schools.

6. The Consultative Committee on the Curriculum was only starting up when I retired so I really cannot comment.
7. I wrote about these in the article I showed you. Numbers 3 and 6 in my list are by far the most important. The most intractable thing to deal with was the attitudes/arrogance/prejudice of those

in the system. Then, of course, there were the fee-paying schools, which took the top kids. I'm convinced parents who paid for their kids' education did so out of snobbery rather than for educational reasons. I could tell you many stories which would show you that once parents saw that comprehensive schools could achieve the same academic end results as 'posh' schools, they were won over, and even expressed a preference for our kind of approach.

8. The Director first in making the conditions (schools, staff, supplies etc), but unquestionably the key people are headteachers and principal teachers. Without their wholehearted backing you can achieve nothing of much value.
9. Total, in all I set out to do. No one ever interfered with my running of the school. I was allowed to do what I wanted.
10. I always got 100% backing from the parents. They always came in large numbers when I called meetings. I often got letters of thanks when their children had left. I always felt they showed me great loyalty.
11. One major problem was the difference between purpose-built schools and older established schools with annexes. Another was the situation you had of academically trained staff who had previously only dealt with academic pupils. They had elitist attitudes, and little knowledge of pupils of average and poor ability. A comprehensive teacher has to be educationally efficient and humanely motivated - both of these are necessary,

especially for underprivileged pupils.

12. Not as far as I know, but then I was working in a purpose-built set-up serving one area.
13. This is a very hard question. There was indignation at some of our colleagues who should never have been there. There were not enough with the proper attitudes. Some comments were made at headteachers' conferences by headmasters who were effectively condemning the whole concept, although they were in fact in charge of 'comprehensive' schools. It was a tragedy, the headteachers' attitudes were ranged on a spectrum from hatred of the comprehensives to feeling lukewarm about them. In the main they were a pretty conservative lot. If I had had the power, I would have had some of them removed. I sometimes wondered, listening to them, if they were doing the same job as me. So the amount of change in internal organisation and practice must have been infinitely invariable, given the range of attitudes that headteachers had.
14. When comprehensive schools came along, in-service and meetings burst into activity. It had an important effect, though it was derided. It provided a spur and an incentive. Ideas were born and developed out of mutual discussion.
15. In one way, their existence was deadly. You may have a humane school with all sorts of wonderful activities, courses and extra mural work going on, but leaving certificate passes and the number of children you send to university is how the general

public will judge you. Your top pupils validate the school for society. I was personally very pleased to see fee-paying schools disappear from the educational scene. They were the bastions of deeply embedded attitudes and superiority. The result was that many comprehensive achievements remained unsung.

16. With great variety and differing levels of commitment, as I have said, the root cause of which was attitudes.
17. Not entirely, or even not by a long way. The comprehensive school is not a panacea, it can only hack away at social injustice, and do what it can to mitigate its effects. Other measures would be required for a revolution. Comprehensive schools are merely a contributory factor in a wider movement. Nevertheless, a fair measure of integration is possible. The two most important things are attitudes and the House System. What can actually be done by some teachers has to be seen to be believed. Pupils have to have self-respect.
18. Secondary 1 is the period for evaluation, but selection has to come, its just a matter of when. You arrange curricula so that movement is always possible. You must constantly bear in mind that there is a great amount of unrevealed talent in most pupils, not necessarily only academic. What this calls for is the creation of the correct environment to provide the stimulus for its release.
19. I remember reading an article criticising comprehensive schools,
+
20. and I thought that, as a professionally committed person, I

couldn't let it pass. So a friend and I collaborated on a reply, and it in its turn drew some foully abusive phone calls and letters. But one of those who had been most vehement in rebutting our pro-comprehensive reply to the original idea took up the headship of a depressed junior secondary school, after careful and agonising thought.

That story I told to show you that change sometimes comes in funny ways. Teachers became involved in a gradual transition they hardly knew they were making. If some had been able to see themselves ten years earlier, they would have hardly believed the change. The headteacher must have a core of like-minded people around him. It's a steady process of learning by example from the more flamboyant or committed members on the staff - a sort of 'if he can do it, so can I' approach. But there's no doubt that it is a hard struggle which takes a constant supply of energy and activity. You'll always have the last - ditch elitists, but you just have to put up with them, and hope their intransigence represents a minority opinion on the staff.

1. a) There is no doubt in my mind that the sources of comprehensive
+
2. education initiatives are to be found in politics. The moves were heavily tinged with egalitarianism, and a desire to achieve a fairer society by social engineering, using the education service as an instrument. The comprehensive school was to be an agent of social change. There was an ideological thrust backed up by certain individuals in the educational world who thought the millennium was just around the corner.
 - b) The post-war baby boom created the need for new school building, so that opportunities were there for change.
 - c) All this was endorsed by an increasing dissatisfaction with the qualifying exam, and the segregation it caused into senior secondary and junior secondary schools.
 - d) Changes in society in the post-war world created a desire to broaden the purpose of the school, and make the curriculum more relevant.
3. The 1947 Report might as well never have been written. It was hardly even mentioned in any school I was in, or even in the Educational Institute of Scotland Education Committee. Comprehensive education did not come about as a result of reports, but of people's personal philosophy and factors in society.
 4. There were moves to institute comprehensive schools long before the 1960's. Overspill population in the new towns and the

building of vast housing estates in the 1950's begged the question of the type of schools that would be necessary. Several schools in Glasgow, with carefully chosen headteachers, were selected as experimental comprehensive schools, in which all sorts of pilot projects were mounted. They attracted new teachers who gradually became conditioned to the new ways, and were inspired by the heads. Gradually, the word was spread in this way. It is important to realise that there was no master plan for comprehensive education. Rather it came about as a result of political/demographic/economic/social factors in confluence at the propitious moment. For a long time senior secondary, junior secondary and comprehensive schools all co-existed in a mixture side by side. There was no overnight transformation.

5. The implications of Circular 600/614 were momentous or not, depending on whether you saw the change as being to your advantage or not - some four year/junior secondary schools had the carrot of being upgraded, but older senior secondary with academic reputations had their character changed out of all recognition. There was a growth factor to deal with, and an optimism in society at large. Vast sums of money were being pumped into education. There was a feeling that the future lay in the comprehensive school, despite the widely-held reservations, because most people would not have liked to back to the former selective system.

6. a) Her Majesty's Inspectors were like butterflies who pollinated good ideas and spread them from school to school, but on a

casual/individual basis rather than as part of a plan.

As far as the Scottish Education Department was concerned, a comprehensive school was a territorial school, and no more. It never went further, either orally or in writing, to spell out what should happen inside one. The main concern was to terminate the senior secondary/junior secondary split at 12. Not much thought was given to the question beyond that.

- b) Local politicians were characterised by a lot of rhetoric, but not much political will on most issues e.g. selective schools. There never was any rearguard action.
- c) The personal views of the Director were important, but so was the political climate of his Education Committee. Glasgow and Renfrew form an interesting contrast in this respect. There was also a myth going around that Scotland had always had comprehensive schools, so that the changeover would not be dramatic. The real problem for them was the rate at which they could effect the transition.
- d) Advisers took more to do with the internal implications of the switch - chiefly curricular and methodological. I still maintain, though, that all that the bureaucrats intended was that schools should be recognised on a territorial basis. When that was accomplished they were satisfied in the main. No one made mandatory the corollary that there should be internal organisational adaptations to match - e.g. common course, mixed-ability classes. Is it not significant that you yourself were giving a talk to headteachers on mixed-ability teaching in 1978, 13 years after Circular 600?

9. Headteachers had complete autonomy. No one told them what to do in their schools. There was a bland assumption that people in promoted posts would act responsibly, and carry out the policy. There was a confidence that the new schools would turn out to be highly successful in the Socialist millennium. This lack of accountability meant that heads 'did their own thing'. Many wanted to maintain their school's credibility in a competitive situation, so many comprehensive schools retained or acquired many of the trappings of the old senior secondary school - prefects, assemblies, magazines, streamed classes. Much depended on the headteachers personal interpretation of the new developments. There was no suggestion that things had to be done in a certain way.
10. Upwardly - mobile parents were worried that their kids would be held back because of the over-concentration on the less able child.
12. As regards internal school organisation, massive changes were certainly IMPLIED by the switch to a comprehensive system, but nobody really wanted to lift up the stones and examine what was happening underneath. Not only was there no outside interference, there was much flannelling about and concealment of what was going on. There was a widespread use of the term 'comprehensive', but virtually no attempt to get down to the nitty gritty of a definition in nuts and bolts terms.
13. In my view, the main impetus for in-service came from raising of the school leaving age, and not the creation of the comprehensive

school. The main concern was what was to be done with the less able in secondary 3/4, and consideration of this brought other questions in its wake.

Most teachers change their practices as a result of wider, environmental factors, rather than from picking up a few nuggets at Dundas Vale. People react when confronted with stark facts. In-service training heightened awareness, gave a bit of momentum but did not make a serious impact. The comprehensive school merely pushed more kids on to Ordinary grade exams.

17. Methodology has not changed much. The scale of values of Her Majesty's Inspectors has. Sound conscientious teaching is no longer in vogue: differentiated learning is. AVA and technology are in greater supply than before. Again, I would say that the fact that these aids are used in schools comes about more from the fact of their availability than from deep philosophical thinking about educational issues.
18. The reality is that only a minority of staff thought seriously about the real implications of comprehensive education, and one or two did excellent work. The vast majority did not adopt a professional approach to the changed circumstances. There was no internal drive to make comprehensive education work. External events over which they had no control made teachers scrutinize their ideas. Having said that, it must be conceded that certain individuals have been influential.
19. It is only recently, in the 1980's, that the real issues in comprehensive education have been mentioned and faced. We are in

fact entering a period of revisionism. Only after Strathclyde Regional Council took 6-7 years to get itself started did it begin to look at questions of policy. The comprehensive school was not a radical concept, but a natural and inevitable result of a coming together of several factors at a certain time. It was an evolutionary process that got a bit of a push by politicians in power at the right moment.

20. A comprehensive school must be a territorial school which offers a full curriculum to all its pupils, but not necessarily equality of treatment. Thereafter, I think it is dangerous to issue edicts about what should happen. So much depends on where the school is, and how forward-thinking the staff is.

1. There's a long tradition of having children in one building to complete their secondary education in this country. I remember in my own day we had Higher Grade schools with Advanced Divisions, and even some children who were kept back in the primary department. My basic belief is that schools cannot provide an education suitable to all the abilities with which it has to cope, despite what educational theorists and politicians try to tell us. It was they who were largely responsible for forcing Scottish education into a comprehensive pattern, but that type of school had really been slowly evolving for many years. In Glasgow, education was in a mess after the war: there were old inadequate buildings, and a distinct lack of qualified teachers. All sorts of dilutees were allowed in. Vast housing estates were being built on the outskirts to replace crumbling inner city slums, but they had no schools. Hence the area school arose in the 50's, and became the model for all future school building. Then the Ordinary grade exam appeared in 1962, and in 1972 raising of the school leaving age was landed on us. These two events are to my mind very important for an understanding of our present problems in comprehensive schools. Changes have occurred, not always for the better, but in the name of modern thinking and relevance.
2. Unquestionably political. There was no intense feeling among teachers that a changeover to a comprehensive system should occur. The academics who wrote on the subject influenced key politicians but not the average teacher. A lot of teachers don't

read books on education anyway. The upshot was that many Scottish teachers were dragged along the line to co-operate, with the inevitable effect on their degree of commitment to the new scheme of things.

3. Comprehensive education appealed when it did because of the perceived needs and circumstances of the period. It was only then that the 1947 Report was seen to have any relevance to the real world, so people started quoting it.
4. Comprehensive education fitted in well with the prevailing social opinion of the time: a fair crack of the whip for all, and a determination to help the disadvantaged and attack all forms of privilege and elitism. The school was seen as a focal point through which these policy objectives could be realised. So, in a word, the time was right for the comprehensive school.
5. Given the vast and previously inexperienced spread of ability, streaming was the solution adopted in almost all comprehensive schools of my acquaintance. Children were grouped from the high flyers down to the 'tail-end Charlies' at the bottom. That's what most headmasters did, even those who claimed to be pro-comprehensive in their thinking.
6. 1) Her Majesty's Inspectors were given a job to do by their political masters - to go out and sell the idea. They did a loyal and professional job, and genuinely tried to help and advise.
2) Given the Labour majority in the West of Scotland, they all said

they were for it.

- 3) Directors and advisers promoted the movement as well, but some of
- + 4) them did not show much genuine commitment, and adopted a tongue-in-cheek posture towards developments. They in fact showed a variation in disposition similar to those recipients who were the object of their persuasion (i.e. teachers).

7. Teachers were far and away the major obstacle - and for good reason. Their own education, training and previous teaching was suddenly 'out', and a new dogma was 'in'. Their views, attitudes to and ideas about education were set, if not ingrained, and it took a lot of sweat to shift some of them. It is so true that you cannot teach an old dog new tricks - and that's what teachers were asked to do, almost overnight.
8. Heads and their staffs bore the brunt without a doubt. It was they who had to interpret the Circular, and work out its practical application in their schools. Very little help came from above, except in the form of financial backing if you wanted anything, especially in the newer schools. But basically you were on your own.
9. As long as you stick to broad policy outlines, you had virtually total freedom to do as you wanted. There was never any interference, and even less attention to or quibble with the details of internal organisation.
10. In my experience, the attitude of most parents was one of apathy

for the most part. Because the changeover was gradual, there was no great opposition. Of course, there were pockets of parents here and there who were worried that their able offspring might be held back by association with less able youngsters.

12. In theory, most schools in Glasgow were called 'comprehensive', but, given their location, they should more properly have been referred to as area schools. There may have been an ability mix, but there was never a social mix. Add to this the well-known fact that teachers naturally tend to prefer working with able children, especially in areas like Easterhouse and Garthamlock. Hence mixed-ability classes were never dealt with fairly.
13. The arrival of the comprehensive school forced us into a consideration of our approach to internal organisation. Principal teachers in particular were asked to consider new ideas. There's no doubt, notwithstanding this, that old cherished notions about children and how to teach them were tenaciously adhered to. The better kids still got the best treatment, especially again in schools where a sizeable proportion of the pupils did not display an interest in formal education. However much that notion may have faded from the limelight, it has never disappeared completely.
14. Teachers Centres and in-service education were a good idea, and brought about much discussion, especially in subject areas. They had some effect, particularly on those who volunteered to attend, but most teachers who changed did so of their own accord, to survive. It's as simple as that.

15. Given the smallish number (relatively speaking) of pupils involved in the Glasgow set up, I doubt if their existence made much difference. The only people who thought it did were the politicians, who saw fee-paying schools as being incongruous with a statement comprehensive system. The fact is, however, that these schools provide a better education, as they are geared to hard work with a view to success in external exams. Their boast is high academic standards. You can't get that in your average comprehensive school.
17. The junior/senior secondary split continued for years. There was no major upheaval or change in the way schools were run and organised. The major difference was that all the pupils went to one school.
18. This thorny question has troubled me for all my teaching life. There is no answer to it, or there is certainly no easy answer. Are streaming and the comprehensive school incompatible? In theory, streaming helps to give a fairer deal to the top pupils - hence its popularity in Scotland. For pupils less able or with less appetite for study, presumably mixed-ability is a better arrangement. Much argument and discussion have been devoted to this question. It is in my mind an absolute conundrum.
19. a) On curriculum to a certain extent, although I felt with a lot it was change for change's sake, rather than because it was better than the old way.
- b) On methods, I am less sure. Basically, though, I don't think teaching methods have changed much this century, despite all the

freshly graduated students who come from colleges indoctrinated with the latest ideas.

20. On those who took the changeover seriously, yes it had the effect of making them question their practice. For the rest, the changeover had little effect. They jogged along much as before.
21. You must make the distinction here between the urban and the rural setting. The omnibus tradition had existed for years in the latter, where the atmosphere was different, and there was a strong tendency to encourage and promote the scholar. But these schools still separated pupils out by ability.
22. a) Equality of opportunity in Scotland meant identifying the 'lads o' pairts,' and pushing them on to academic success. The others stumbled along as best they could till they left. The crazy idea went around at the time of the introduction of the comprehensive school that all pupils had an equal brain. The only way to have equality of opportunity is remove the dross. The school leaving age should be reduced to 14, and those who elect to stay on should be allowed to do so conditional upon acceptable attendance and progress in study.

b) Yes, undoubtedly. Examples abound to prove it.
23. A comprehensive school must accept the fact that all children are not equal, and consequently it must strive to cater for all types of brain, and all types of aptitude. There must be provision for all according to the talent they demonstrate. But fine-sounding

aims like those must be interpreted in the context of the real world, in which tenancy, behavioural problems, parental lack of interest, not to mention social problems of all sorts exist, and curb the possible outcomes of schooling. They also presuppose an energetic and committed teaching force.

24. No, it hasn't even begun to be tapped. Schools have been asked to do more than they are capable of, and a basic fact has escaped the attention of many: most kids who arrive at the age of 11/12 at the secondary school gates have already had their picture of the world influenced by their home circumstances, and by wider society, with all its alluring features which compete for their attention. Many factors totally extraneous to the school have a powerful influence on children and, therefore, on what the school can reasonably hope to achieve. Many children are already moulded before they leave primary school. That's what comes through the gates each morning: that's where the comprehensive school has to begin.

1. The whole comprehensive thing started in the world of politics. No one in education, except those with extreme left wing views, was advocating radical change.
2. I am not aware of the 1947 Report having had much influence. It certainly was not discussed in schools. The impulse towards comprehensive schools is decent but stupid. It illustrates how the Labour Party has influenced education wrongly, albeit with noble motives. Junior secondary pupils were not deprived - contrary to popular opinion. They had sensible instincts. They wanted a job, which was seen as a basis for self-respect, not French and Latin. Comprehensive education forced a lot of decent but academically dull children to absorb subjects that they had no interest in. Simple down-to-earth practical education with a vocational slant was what they wanted to suit their level. There was always night school later if they wanted a go at getting qualifications. There's nothing elitist about that.
5. The mass result of the introduction of comprehensive education was that junior secondary kids were force-fed on an inappropriate diet they could not digest, so they were misled and wasted their time.
6. a) Her Majesty's Inspectors did what they were told by the civil servants of the day. They are political servants who come round peddling the latest fad.

- b) Labour Councillors were all for comprehensive education. They thought it would give decent ordinary kids a greater chance. They followed the party line, but were so wrong. They had not an inkling of the implications of what they were advocating. The intentions were good, but it was a dead-duck from the start.
 - c) Educational officials were the servants of the Committee. They did what they were told, and coped with the administrative implications of policy decisions.
 - d) Advisers were place-in-the-sun seekers. A few did good work. Most were affable balloons, unaware of what was happening in schools.
7. By and large, people in education do what they are told. There is no digging-in of heels. In spite of Her Majesty's Inspectors pushing teachers in a 'comprehensive direction', most teachers, who are simple, honest, hardworking folk, went their own way, working towards getting good Scottish Certificate of Education results for their pupils. I openly disagreed with Her Majesty's Inspectors who wanted change. I simply said 'not in my school'. I asked one inspector one day why, if the old methods which he was not advocating should be abolished were bad, did so many of his colleagues get good Honours degrees? He never gave me an answer yet.
9. Heads had almost total latitude inside their schools. In fact, the Director once introduced me to a group of people at a meeting as one of his best headmasters. Asked by me to explain, he pointed out that I hardly ever phoned the education offices with

problems. That's it in a nutshell: they didn't want to know.

10. There was no massively large-scale reaction from parents. Politicians achieved two things: they raised the expectations of many parents, and worried some whose children were now going to mix with former junior secondary types. The divided system did well by a lot of pupils in Scotland. Intense political interest and interference in the educational world spoiled all that.
11. a) Area schools had super kids, but the staffing was so bad they never got a fair crack of the whip.
b) Private schools were so small in number that they had very little effect.
12. Comprehensive schools tried to merge junior secondary and senior secondary schools. They did not succeed, and ended up being unfair to both groups, and selling them short. Overall, there was not much change in what happened within schools.
13. In-service courses were poor. They tried to brainwash participants into adopting teaching styles they knew would not work.
14. a) Most headteachers don't have educational or social ideas. They are really just teachers who want to do their job. Many took the line: if you want me to be a comprehensive headteacher, I'll give it a go.
b) Most were basically opposed to the idea, but they went along with

it as best they could. They liked junior secondary pupils as people, but didn't really want to teach them for too long. A lot of good teaching ideas for the less able went out the window when the comprehensives arrived with their insane, fancy ideas. A lot of kids were lost and missed out on the basics for the sake of a political theory, which had to create an educational one to match.

16. Solutions adopted to mixing children of different abilities and teach them in the same room failed miserably in practice. Mixed-ability was a shambles. Children prefer to be separated, and work at their own pace, and not have their inabilities emphasised by comparison with other kids in the same room.
17. a) The content of some subjects changed, and there were new types of exam. Often both were not for the better.
b) People did make sincere efforts to change but overall there was no improvement in teaching methods.
19. The comprehensive school was a new theory devised by politicians, not educationists, to bring change to a system which separated children into separate schools according to ability. The comprehensive school was seen as a corrective to sociological errors committed in the past. It was itself a mistaken idea.
20. Equality of opportunity was not achieved by the creation of comprehensive schools. Teachers with their acute social conscience were concerned to care for the able, so that their opportunities would not be damaged. Opportunity has to be

wanted. Motivation has to be there: The comprehensive school forced opportunity on to those who did not want it. The discipline, training and assumption of responsibility which characterise the senior secondary school were lost for ever in an effort to be kind to everyone.

A crucial question is: what is a comprehensive school? A social mix in the pupils is desirable but not essential, but there must be some attempt to integrate pupils of all abilities, at least to start with. Mixed-ability teaching is inherent in the notion of comprehensive school. A comprehensive school is one which refuses no pupil and does its best for them.

-----started as a hotch potch of new pupils from a sprawling housing estate and older ones from a city junior secondary school, and my job was to build it up into a comprehensive school. One of the boys who had been sent to the junior secondary school went on to become school captain, and go to University.

I used to extract remedial pupils in secondary 1, but gave it up as the class became a focus of discontent and bad discipline problems. I felt it was important to select principal teachers who were sympathetic to the ideals of comprehensive education. I was lucky that the Director allowed me to have the final say in appointments. Although you had to be on your guard: many people can produce fine speeches at interview to sell themselves and get a job, then don't deliver the goods where it counts. I always felt that science subjects were way ahead of all others in terms of development.

A great deal of lip-service was paid to comprehensive education. A lot of people put on a show for the Director because they felt they should be seen to be doing the new thing. But in reality there was profound disapproval of the whole idea, and the inherent conservatism of teachers inhibited development for a long time. Most of the problems were in the schools, not caused by events outside them. A lot of teacher's just did

not want to play. That was the reality!

The philosophy of the headteacher and principal teachers was the most crucial element in any school. Also important was the extent to which you were democratic and ran an open school with plenty of meetings and discussions, so that everybody was made to feel a part of the whole operation. Teachers need to have a genuine say on important issues. Sadly, a lot of heads either had an elitist philosophy or no philosophy at all, and ran their schools on strictly authoritarian lines. Others showed enthusiasm on the surface, but when they saw the nitty-gritty realities and implications of true comprehensive education, the keenness waned rapidly.

The whole thing got off to a bad start for other reasons. The conversion was ordered to occur with absolutely no preparation, no extra money, old syllabuses and materials. The 'fait accompli' nature of it all left many departments floundering, even those that were genuinely trying to cope with the change. Many just fell back on their old ways, brought out the old notes, and went on as before. For many people drama was Shakespeare and poetry and Wordsworth, if you see what I mean. A lot of people were set in their ways and were uncomfortable at the thought of breaking new ground. Help from advisers and in-service came far too late, and even then only reached a small proportion of the staff who were keen enough to go. A minority of advisers was enthusiastic. The rest were either office-bound and bogged down in paper, or were themselves from an elitist background, and hadn't a clue about the realities of life in a large comprehensive school.

The Directorate were little or no help with educational problems, though they tried to be helpful if you asked. They generally did not want to

know what was going on, and were quite happy to let you do your own thing, as long as you did not go to extremes.

The promotion system was not good, and some dreadful appointments were made. There was a lot of canvassing, and many political appointments were made which had nothing to do with the ideas or philosophy of comprehensive schools. Some senior people in the posts created after the Green Paper were quite frankly appalling. In fact, when I saw them at interviews, it astonished me that they had made it to principal teacher. It is open to debate how much assistant headteachers and guidance posts in general contributed to the creation of a good comprehensive system of education. The idea was good; some of the people who got the jobs were distinctly not.

Comprehensive education got off the ground on a quite definite political basis, but amidst all the political jargon and debates, there were some very sound educational ideas. It all started in England, and was brought up here because national policy was created to solve the problems of the English educational system. They were far ahead of us in setting up comprehensive schools. The lumpen proletariat of Scottish teachers were happy with the senior secondary/junior secondary split, and even happier if they did not have to have experience in the latter. Only the forward-thinkers saw junior secondary schools as a horrible abomination. Most folk saw them as a necessary evil. Late developers had no chance, and mostly, once you were put in a course or stream, that was that for all time. Pupils performed as well or as badly as teachers expected them to. A lot of primary reports contained highly subjective statements and opinions about pupils. I refused to let any member of staff see these, so as to avoid early preconceived ideas adversely

affecting their judgement of the new intake.

Comprehensive provision really implied a total rethink of the entire educational system, but very few people were prepared to go back to the drawing board and redraft their approach. However, as comprehensive education became accepted practice the lump was very gradually leavened, and a gradual shift in outlook became evident over time. More discussion took place in school Committees, older staff passed out of schools, and younger keener people filled their places. There is no doubt that promotion prospects were enhanced for those who were 'doing it right'. When I retired, I felt we were getting there, but it had been an uphill struggle.

A major problem was that there was a total lack of overall planning and co-ordination of the new system. It was really up to individuals what was made of it. As long as all children were unsegregated at the point of entry to secondary 1, the 'quali' was dead and we had 'comprehensive' secondary schools. The only pointers came from Her Majesty's Inspectors, who tried to nudge schools in a comprehensive direction. Even they only did so in general terms, not in specific questions of curriculum and methods. Their background for the most part precluded a knowledge of the comprehensive school. They knew as little as anyone else, but had to appear to be enthusiastic and knowledgeable at conferences. They have no authority to make people go down a certain road. They merely advise and report to their superiors.

Mixed-ability teaching and the common course were favourite Inspectors' subjects, because they saw as they went round the so-called 'comprehensive' school the same junior secondary/senior secondary

divisions as had existed in the segregated set up. They were attempts to force schools to integrate a spectrum of pupils educationally and socially. Mostly both attempts failed, but worked in a minority of cases with good staff who had worked out a methodology and materials and teaching styles to match. So many schools had the nonsense of mixed-ability classes alongside prefects, enforced uniform and prize givings. That told you a lot. The best attempts were where a real effort was made to create a comprehensive ethos among pupils and an 'esprit de corps' among staff. Such schools were the better for being truly comprehensive, but a large number went in for a sham version. A lot of heads were Ghengis Khan figures who paid lip-service to the idea. I think there is a better quality of headteacher being appointed now. A great many senior staff at all levels in the service assumed comprehensive education had been created and was working successfully. There was no question asked to see if it really was. I hear that people nowadays are expected to be au fait with all educational developments and that there is more accountability since Regionalisation. A good thing!

1. The Labour administration and a good and forward-thinking education committee which took a strong socialist line. I was long associated with the Scottish Socialist Teachers Society - in fact was latterly secretary of it. It embraced Labour, Independent Labour Party and Communist views in its membership, and was very influential, especially with members of the Labour Council. It's main aim was to plug the idea that the junior secondary/senior secondary divide was just not on. It became a powerful pressure group in the city and indeed on the Educational Institute of Scotland. You see, many teachers did not - and possibly still do not - have a broad view of their job. They did their work without really thinking where education was going. Men like Andrew Hood (Sec. Educational Institute of Scotland, Lanarkshire) and Allan Young (Sec. Educational Institute of Scotland, Glasgow) did a great deal to get the movement off the ground.
2. Undoubtedly political, because of perceived feelings of discontent at the separation of children at the age of 12. Inseparably from that was also a growing awareness of the massive waste of talent that was occurring because 'final' decisions were taken on children too early.
3. It was a great Report. Robertson was a brilliant man with great vision. It gave everybody a fillip. I think that it was made possible by the progressive thinking on education which characterised the Butler era, and indeed the Conservative party.

I would say that Butler's views opened the door to the developments which ensued.

4. I would say it was the result of pressure which originated in England, where things were much worse than they ever were here. London was a place where things were striving.
5. The main one was that the primary school categories began gradually to be disregarded.
6. 1) Some of them wanted to get out of the academic straitjacket, especially a man like J.S. Brunton. He wanted to make education more meaningful, and have attainable educational targets for pupils who could not tackle national exams. He was aware of the senior secondary/junior secondary gap, and that concentration on the academic aspects of education was not of much use to a large number of pupils.
- 2) My view is that in Glasgow they were by and large far-sighted, much more so than in other parts of Scotland.
- 3) They were a varied bunch. Some undoubtedly were energetic, but really I think it amounted to a response to satisfy demands for more money and career prospects for teachers. Adviser posts caused a proliferation of lance-corporals who got money for doing jobs that no one had done before - almost for the sake of the fact that the jobs had been created.
- 4) Stewart Mackintosh was clearly a constructive force, and he gave nothing but the go ahead to ideas. His views counted and held sway. He also spent money like water on education. 5) It was

to my knowledge always supportive of the Director's ideas and initiatives. I do not recall it's ever going against Dr. Mackintosh.

6. Since the Consultative Committee on the Curriculum only came into existence in 1965 and I retired in 1968, I really did not have many dealings with it.

7. Number one was the immobility of teachers' attitudes. Even the best of them saw teaching as an academic job, the aim of which was 'teach them!' 'make them learn'. A strong side of the comprehensive principle was social you know. Some of my best teachers, while they didn't oppose this, they weren't exactly happy. They didn't see that as part of their job.

One of the hardest jobs was making teachers aware of the weaknesses of the previous segregated system.

Number two - Buildings - most of which were not purpose-built, but old selective schools with strong academic traditions were a problem in some cases.

8. The drive and planning came from the centre. Dr. Mackintosh carefully selected his headteachers. Part of the problem was that some later headteachers who are in positions of great power and influence, were disastrous. In my opinion, some of them should never have become headmasters. Some really hadn't a clue what it was all about.

Also Jordanhill College had one or two far-sighted and able men who planned training along the right lines, men like Round, Nicolson and Bone before he became Principal.

9. A great deal of freedom. I could boost departments in my school, and had freedom to promote people I wanted to promote because they were energetic and enthusiastic about what we were trying to do.
10. It was a perfect set up in ----- . It was a new community full of people who had a vision of a new life for their kids. It was also a split-new building. There was a new staff, no ready-made clique waiting to knock me down. All was set up for me to get my ideas across. There was no prejudice, only enthusiasm. It was more of a community centre than a school. We had Parent-Teachers Association meetings every month. It was important to make parents feel they were part of the school. We had excellent social workers who went into houses and kept the links going.
12. Not in the new housing estates on the outskirts of the city, but in other areas I'm sure the persistence of snobbery was a hindrance. For example, when ----- opened it was a 4 year school, and we were meant to send our ablest pupils to the senior secondary down the road, which was a wee bit more 'snooty'. In fact, both the parents and I were most reluctant to do this. I held on to my able pupils by offering them academic targets in ----- they could get at ----- . We offered certificate exams at lower in secondary 4, perhaps unscrupulously, but it was done to make our pupils feel that ----- was their school and they had no need to go to another one. In fact, we started a campaign to have the school upgraded. I'll always remember the 24th June 1962 when Ian Cunningham (Depute Director of Education) phoned to say from the following session we would be a complete secondary

school. We just forced the issue.

13. You had to be careful to so arrange your school that you provided satisfaction for the staff. Otherwise, we'd have lost principal teachers to 'better' schools. In secondary 1 when we opened, we arranged our 10 first year sections into 2 able, 8 average and 2 less able groups. Although movement (mostly upwards) occurred, we became dissatisfied with it. We then moved to complete mixed-ability which unquestionably made for a better atmosphere. All pupils were encouraged to compete against the best but without bad feelings. Some of our teachers did sterling work which I'll always remember. Some unfortunately were more hostile, and did not. Mixed-ability made social and disciplinary problems more manageable. I also held regular class conferences at 4 o'clock to discuss problems with teachers. It was, also, remarkable at these how older teachers helped younger ones.
- We also tried to give all pupils as wide a choice of options that our staff would allow. Our so-called 'peripheral' developments did great work - technical was good, art was prominent and music outstandingly good. You really were so dependent on staff in these developments.
14. Teachers' Centres played a very important role, more pronounced after I retired. I remember our science chaps floundering a bit with all the new stuff they were being asked to take on board. After I went there was so much new thinking and curriculum change that these centres were necessary.
15. I think it would be true to say that the existence of fee-paying

schools robbed some comprehensive schools of their share of the most able pupils, especially in the so-called 'better areas'. In this connection, I remember talking at length to the parents of a ----- boy who wanted to transfer him to Allan Glen's School. It happened by chance that Dr. Mackintosh was in school that day, so both of us saw them. All we could say was that we would do our best to make sure that he got as good an education at ----- as he would get at Allan Glen's School. In the event he went to Allan Glen's School, but to my amazement and pleasure, returned after 2 years to rejoin his old classmates in secondary 3 in -----.

16. a) There was undoubted jealousy from some of them about how successful the pioneering comprehensive schools turned out to be. In addition, in the Glasgow Head Teachers' Association there was outright hostility to the comprehensive idea, especially from the more elderly headmasters who were thirled to the Scottish academic tradition and didn't much like 'the comprehensive thing'. Those headmasters who were expressly chosen because of their sympathy to the comprehensive principle were great, and did achieve success. The rest were at best reluctant, even within such a progressive Authority as Glasgow. Outside Glasgow, to the best of my recollection, other headteachers were dominated by the views of a small group of heads from omnibus or country secondary schools. They should have been in sympathy with the comprehensive movement, given that they had all abilities from the surrounding area in their schools. In fact they were a pretty reactionary bunch, although they were in charge of de facto comprehensive schools.

b) There always was a noticeable 'age divide' in reactions - quite definitely. Senior principal teachers never liked the thought of dealing with less able pupils. They would have preferred to deal exclusively with the ablest pupils, if I had let them away with it. In the young staff, there was an enthusiasm and willingness to make it work. In most of the new schools in the housing estates, I'd say that there were many young staff doing very good work from about 1962-3 onwards.

17. I would say that the main avenue for joining the two formerly separate groups was through the house system, and its related social programme. James Christie and I went on a week's study tour of London comprehensive schools where we saw schools divided into smaller units for pastoral care. You see, many opponents of comprehensive schools in England argued that, to be successful, comprehensive schools had to have a huge roll to facilitate 6th form work. This in my view was a red herring.

18. a) Perhaps I took - and take - a too idealistic view. But I think it should be deferred until the end of secondary 2. Mixed-ability classes are good for general morale, and have a definite uniting effect on the staff and pupils. It is amazing what some children can achieve when they are given success.

b) There was a great willingness to say that comprehensive education did not work, but those who held that view had not really tried it. Really not much effort was made. Is it asking too much of teachers? I think not - we were able to maintain good standards in mixed-ability classes for 2 years. But most people were so

hinged to the notion of academic achievement, that their only worry was the fate of the able child.

19. A great deal. We started close links with our feeder primary schools, and brought in all sorts of 'Brunton courses' - retail distribution, motor mechanics, painting and decorating, plumbing and building. Instructors from Further Education colleges came into schools, and pupils went out on work experience, so that they got education out of school.

We also instituted a programme of social education, with four housestaff, each with an unpaid 'deputy', and a team of 10 registrars under their supervision. Registration we tried to run every morning as a family system - 20 minutes each day. The same class had the same registrar and housemaster for 4 years. In the formal curriculum, we gave every child a chance to show us what he could do. Only in exceptional circumstances did we refuse a child into his chosen course.

We also instituted frequent meetings and discussions - often after 4 o'clock - so that we could keep tabs on what was actually happening.

20. To a great extent. In effect, it called for a rethink of both content and method. You know, there were some damned good teachers around then, who did a great job. I often had admiration for the few teachers with a most academic background who responded in a most positive way to the challenge that comprehensive education put their way. Personally, I found that women teachers often made the better teachers as a rule. Men are often a bit casual about their work.

21. Even the most reactionary elements in Scottish education were quite obviously dissatisfied with the old junior secondary/senior secondary set-up. So there was a willingness to embrace change, but age was a big stumbling block. It was really a question of what you were used to, and how much you were prepared to change well-established practices. Nowadays, I think it is generally accepted that comprehensive schools are the shape of things to come.

Let's not also forget the class divide in Scottish society which was not easily bridged. Some parents were just determined to have 'something better' as they saw it.

22. a) I suppose it depends on whether you are the son of a manse in the country or a Govan shipbuilder's son. It all depends on family expectation and aspiration. I once did a study of primary schools in the Gorbals, and discovered that the extremely low percentage of pupils they sent to senior secondary school had nothing to do with the fact that they did not have the ability as judged by the 'quali', but that they came from homes where education was not perceived as the way forward.

b) Yes, many in the Labour Party believed that selective schooling was the way to get on and make the most of your talents.

23. a) The key concept in the co-existence of pupils of all backgrounds and abilities who are able to share all the facilities and activities of the school without favour or discrimination. All are entitled to a fair share of all that's going. The academic side, though very important, I would place secondary to what I've

just said.

b) There was a good deal of grumbling that comprehensive education was 'airy-fairy', 'pie in the sky'. It always worried me that teachers merely do what they are told, most of the time and do not openly or seriously question what is happening around them. By and large teachers are not forward-thinking. There is a pathetic acceptance of instructions - especially among headteachers, whose catch phrase was - is? - 'I'd better ask the office'.

24. Compared with its former products, I have no doubt that education as it presently organised is turning out a better finished article. Although it is a limited criterion, you only need to look at Scottish Certificate of Education Examination Board statistics. That apart, the whole atmosphere of relationships in schools is much more healthy than it ever was.

1. When I left for a post abroad in 1963 there was no talk of comprehensive schools in school circles. The subject was not mooted. It just became out of the blue, a political fait accompli, as part of Labour's educational policy.
2. It was, in my view, most decidedly a political move. Teachers who worked in ordinary schools sent their own children to fee-paying corporation schools, which had a tremendous cachet. They had very low fees, but competition to get in, and once you were in, was very high. They had outstanding academic reputations. The dearest thing about them was their uniforms. A lot of teachers and businessmen used them. Although the atmosphere in them varied: I taught both in Allan Glen's and Hillhead; in the former the boys responded well to staff, and were keen to learn in a very competitive atmosphere. In Hillhead, you were made to feel more of a servant, there to do a job.
3. It was part and parcel of the same spirit which produced the 1946 (Scotland) Act. Both suffered the same fate in their implementation: the politicians took out of them what they wanted, the vote-catching bits and promoted them. Other bits met with political and educational silence, if not rejection. Both documents saw problems not in isolation, but as a whole, against a world background. They were inspired by a vision. Teachers in Scotland have always been treated badly by their superiors, not at all as human beings with feelings and views. As a result, the theoretical and the actual are destined never to meet. In

addition, an innate conservatism means that innovative practices or ideas have a difficult task to make any inroads into traditional procedures.

4. Junior secondary schools were appallingly badly regarded by most teachers, in effect as an inevitable and much despised endurance, a stint which had to be tolerated to get promotion into a senior secondary, and so get a better job and pension. Most junior secondary teachers loathed working or having to work in them. Such an atmosphere meant death to all concerned - staff and pupils alike. You were regarded as one of the lucky blessed if you had never been inside one. Nevertheless, the junior secondary/senior secondary split was still accepted, and even regarded as natural and right by many teachers. Any recollection of resentment I now have was not that junior secondary schools existed, but rather occasioned by the fact that some staff had to go there. The only junior secondary schools that were successful were those with committed, charismatic heads, and a staff who identified with the pupils. Most were dreadful places. So I think that official awareness of the junior secondary disaster was a powerful contributory factor in getting talk round to integrating them with senior secondaries i.e. creating comprehensive schools to end the awful divide.

6. 1) Some Her Majesty's Inspectors, really pushed comprehensives. So some were for it, and they went around dictating to heads what to do. It was as if a sudden decision had been taken, and overnight we were going to have comprehensive schools. There was no thought whatever given to the poor teachers and how they were to

cope. There was a dreadful lack of teacher education/preparation, no awareness that they were thinking adults with opinions that would need to be won round. It was just assumed that a few talks and in-service courses would get thousands of teachers to alter their outlook on and approach to their job.

- 2) They played a vocal and prominent role in pushing the comprehensive school, some of them in an almost fanatical way. Nothing else would do and, if necessary, they had enough of a majority to force the issue. Some of them behaved like members of a political mafia group.
- 3) They were appointed but were never given any power. They should have had an educational force, a cutting edge to shape things in the curriculum and methods. Many retreated to the office and became immersed in administrative concerns. Those with initiative and a sense of purpose got out.
- 4) Education officials are constantly pushed in a particular political direction. I don't feel many of them felt deeply about comprehensive education. They also have very little preparation for the posts of immense responsibility they occupy. Stewart Mackintosh definitely was in a class by himself - he knew his schools and many of his staff. He had a quite definite educational philosophy. He saw himself as having a personal responsibility for what happened to children in his schools. That was not so evident in his juniors, and became less and less evident after he went. Scottish education in general is characterised by a narrowness and lack of vision. Those with a philosophy are few. Regionalisation has exacerbated the

traditional at the expense of the innovative.

7. The obstacle above all others was the outlook of a lot of the teaching staff. Scottish schools, and the whole educational system, operate on tramlines. The power and vested interests of individual subjects is enormous. This is reinforced by bodies like the Consultative Committee on the Curriculum and Educational Institute of Scotland. There was no wooing of teaching staff, no attempt to complement them with the appropriate courses etc for a new system which was for many totally outwith their field of experience. There was a sort of cavalier attitude from those in positions of authority over schools. 'You'll soon learn' was the answer to those who had to face the day-to-day implications of Circulars 600 and 614.
9. I always had a fair measure of latitude especially on planning, buildings etc. All I ever got were general guidelines on internal organisation of my school. Largely, I could do as I and my staff wanted.
10. In our area the majority were anxious and apprehensive. When the decision to close the ----- school became known, a substantial number of parents withdrew their children to private schools, even though the selective intake was guaranteed, and a safe completion of the courses they had embarked on.
12. Yes, being in a so-called 'good' area, the merger of ----- with ----- raised not a few eyebrows.

13. Mixed-ability teaching secondary 1/secondary 2 and the guidance structure, with other new posts stand out in my mind as being the most significant changes.
- A lot of traditional 'academic' subjects still retained streaming or setting by ability, as early as I would allow it. Maths and modern languages stand out here.
14. Compared with lots of countries abroad, the attempts here at in-service were pathetically inadequate. Teachers had no chance to get familiar with the new ideas, even those who wanted to. Their existence is intensely pressurised. Coping with classes takes precedence over theoretical/philosophical issues. The educational planning for the changeover to a comprehensive system was very poor. The enormity of the task was not grasped. When the choice facing you was teach the class in front of you, or absorb and implement new ideas, most teachers opted for the former. Some teachers were good at innovating in practice, but it was really down to the individual teacher, principal teacher and headteacher. In addition, how can you chastise someone who does a good honest hardworking job, and teaches his classes as he thinks he should, for not being innovative?
16. Most paid lip-service to the philosophy of Circular 600. Look at the failure of raising of the school leaving age, and so many other failures in the system in the 60's and 70's. There was a lack of acceptance of the new order, a lack of energy, of willingness to face 'the revolution'. So most heads marked time, especially if their retirement date was in sight. If comprehensive education, guidance and raising of the school

leaving age had all been tackled with sufficient enthusiasm and imagination, we would never have needed Munn and Dunning.

17. That depended. It killed the corporation fee-paying schools, and made the lives of many of the pupils who had to go to them a misery. The social cachet and snobbishness of those schools dubbed a lot of the new comers as inferior and failures before they even came. Some of these schools were second to none, and were sacrificed on the altar of egalitarianism. Similarly, some of the city's fine senior secondaries went the same way. I admired more the staff who got out into the private sector who were at least honest, than those who stayed on and operated their classes as they always had. The extent to which the junior secondary/senior secondary split altered depended entirely on headteachers and principal teachers. I fear significant changes were not widespread.
18. It depends entirely on your educational philosophy. Certainly mixed-ability classes did not work. Teachers got no training - they continued to teach to an exam, and the power of individual subjects militated against innovation.
19. Yes, the curriculum was affected, but it sadly lacked what guidance had - promotion prospects, vast in-service provision. It was, in a word, 'in'. As a result the curriculum was overshadowed, allowed to limp along as best it could, or was permitted to. There was no curricular impetus, though it was sorely needed. As a result, principal teachers began to experience an erosion of their position, and resentment towards

guidance grew up, when the very opposite was required. Her Majesty's Inspectors to whom I mentioned this schism did not seem interested.

Methods did change but in an ad hoc fashion. The shift required of teachers was not recognised. Not enough was done for teachers, and many solved problems of methodology with the belt.

20. Again, the stimulus to scrutinise ideas was just not there in sufficient force. Teachers were not given time to adapt.

21. I don't know that the comprehensive school did articulate with the Scottish tradition. It really didn't get a chance. 'Comprehensive' became a dirty word, both in the profession and in the media, much was blamed on it, and people were influenced by the much talked-of failures. A lot of good work that went on was not heard of. It was almost like one culture fighting against another, not unlike Rangers v Celtic.

22. The power of the old school tie lingered on. Old methods, exam domination and a very blinkered view of what education is all about meant that the importance of academic traditions was never lost in Scotland, not really. The result was that comprehensive education ironically acted against a lot of children who became the victims of an indelible view of what a school was for. Tradition ruled the roost, not surprising really, given that teachers were never consulted, and had comprehensives imposed on them from outside for good or ill.

b) Yes, a lot of people in the Labour Party favoured selective

schools - a well known fact, with lots of cases to prove it.

23. My definition of a comprehensive school would be a small Scottish town academy or omnibus school, which at least recognised the different pace of learning to its pupils, and set them realistic targets. These schools were the epitome of the Scottish tradition - education for all, suited to individual abilities. To that extent they were democratic institutions.

24. No, the potential of the comprehensive school has not been fully tapped. The implications of the changeover took a long time to be fully appreciated; not enough attention was paid to the plight of the classroom teacher, too much was naively assumed; the placing of some schools militated against their success, i.e. town planning was poor; and above all, the motives for introducing comprehensive schools were wrong.

1. The source of initiatives was a political stance, with which the Director was in sympathy. Several schools were opened as pilot schools, but to my knowledge, there was no monitoring of their success. All new schools opened in the city were given the name comprehensive, and shown off like educational palaces. The intention of the Directorate was a good one, a humanitarian attempt to achieve equality, and do away with social injustice. The school was certainly being seen as a tool of social engineering. This of course was a lofty ideal, and when it obviously failed, headteachers were blamed for the ills of society.
2. Primarily, the moves were political. The senior secondary/junior secondary system was unjust, but was not perceived as such. Those who taught in senior secondary schools had an easy life with high job satisfaction. One or two junior secondary schools were very good, with some very caring teachers. But there was no push for common secondary schools from among teachers. The generality of teachers did not see the selective system as unjust.
3. Most teachers do not read reports. The 1947 Report, if it had any influence at all, would mould the thinking of Her Majesty's Inspectors and Scottish Education Department officials. But it had no real impact. To effect true comprehensive education in a city like Glasgow you would have to find a way round the ghetto schools in housing estates. You would have to bus pupils, and

this would be unacceptable. These schools have to fight against tremendous odds, one of which is that educational achievement or success is not held in high regard. At least a school like the High School of Glasgow offered a way out for pupils from these areas.

4. In my view, the justification for a comprehensive school is the possibility of setting. When the notion of mixed-ability classes came in, many heads and staff did not understand it. The corollary of mixed-ability classes is that you have to know the ability of each child, so that it can be placed in a truly mixed-ability class. Some of the notions about how to operate a comprehensive school were inflicted from on high on teachers who hadn't a clue. All they knew was class teaching. Having to face children ranging from IQ 140 - IQ 70 was bitterly resented, and caused many discipline problems. Also many of these 'desirable' changes came at a time of chronic staff shortage.
6. a) Her Majesty's Inspectors were the source of many trendy ideas, which they gathered from visits to schools in this country and abroad. During the sixties and seventies their image changed from being like Gods to becoming advisers and consultants. They themselves were unsure about many of the ideas they were promoting.
- b) In general, local politicians followed the policy of their party, or of the ruling group on the council. They knew little about what went on inside schools. They were interested and helpful when asked, but took up their stance on ideological/sentimental grounds, rather than on real knowledge.

- c) Education officials very much took the view that heads were appointed to run their schools, so they did not interfere. They were supportive if you had difficulties. After all they are officers of the authority, and must carry out the policy made by the politicians. Educationally, they gave no lead, and offered no firm structure for the operation of comprehensive education.
 - d) The best advisers were excellent, and gave a lot of help and advice to departments. Others were next to useless, and stayed in the office. You hardly ever saw them.
 - e) The Consultative Committee on the Curriculum and its plethora of reports and papers was only useful for able and enthusiastic teachers. A body like that is wholly dependent on teacher attitude, and on concerned teachers who think about their work. Not all teachers do.
7. The main obstacles to the introduction of comprehensive education - were:
- raising of the school leaving age in the middle of it all
 - staff shortage
 - the quality and attitude of teachers
 - part-time education
 - lack of planning and direction
 - an important point here is that the arrival of the comprehensive school seemed to herald a trendy, permissive view, which was anti-discipline. Many good features of senior secondary schools disappeared, because they were alleged to be contradictory to the comprehensive ethos.

9. I was never aware of directives being issued on how to organise my school. In earlier days, a headteacher's judgement was respected and trusted. Nowadays there is a very authoritarian, anti-headteacher feeling in the Directorate in Strathclyde. I always took the view that regulations were guides to be adapted or ignored if that was best for the pupils in your school. Headteachers are not slaves.
10. The strongest parental feelings I recall being expressed came from an antagonism towards merging senior secondary and junior secondary schools. The parents of abler kids were horrified at the prospect of the possible association with junior secondary 'types'. Some of the mergers were very badly done. As always, social rather than educational values and perspectives were very much to the fore. I also think that the parents of junior secondary kids had wildly exaggerated expectations of what the comprehensive school could do for their sons and daughters. It was a bit of a con, because very few got Ordinary grades.
11. I agree that both private schools and area schools in housing estates meant that you could not say in all honesty that we had a comprehensive system. Nowadays, the Parents' Charter has been the death knell of the comprehensive system.
12. Many schools continued to be run on selective lines, even though they were called 'comprehensive'. The timetable, curriculum and teaching methods were all governed by the demands of the able and the Scottish Certificate of Education. Only a minority of schools were in any sense child-centred. Many people never faced

up to making provision for less able children.

13. In-service training made a valuable contribution to those teachers who attended.

14. a) Many heads lived in the traditions of senior secondary/junior secondary education. How could you realistically expect anything else? The arrival of the comprehensive school was thus a shock to the system for many folk. Most heads, however, made a conscientious attempt to deal with comprehensive education as they saw it. Things were slightly better in purpose-built comprehensives.

b) As younger teachers with experience or knowledge of comprehensive education came in to schools, there was a greater adjustment to what was required, a greater social awareness. Always remember, though, that the day-to-day problems some children have are unknown to many teachers.

15. I would say that what went on inside schools varied with the
+
16. philosophy of the headteacher, and the quality and attitudes of the heads of subject departments.

17. a) The curriculum expanded, new subjects appeared and syllabuses were modernised.

b) The biggest changes in methods were an increased use of technology, and the avalanche of worksheets, which were a refuge for lazy teachers.

I do not know if teaching methods changed all that much, but I

would say that the atmosphere in classrooms was much better than in the old days.

18. In general, only the able, enthusiastic teachers scrutinise what they do. What has proved almost impossible is the achievement of parity of esteem for non - Scottish Certificate of Education pupils.
19. The comprehensive school was most decidedly a departure from the Scottish educational tradition. Even omnibus schools were segregated inside. You only have to consider the time it took even to get Standard grade courses launched to understand that a lot of attitudinal and practical difficulties inhibited progress and innovation! In my view, comprehensive theories about education rest on false emotions, and fly in the face of genetic differences and common sense.
20. Most people saw equality of opportunity in terms of access to Scottish Certificate of Education exams. Only a few had any broader vision of education than that.

1. I remember the issue becoming sensitive and controversial in the late 60's early 70's
2. Unquestionably Labour Councillors promoted the comprehensive school.
3. Without a doubt the moves were political. Those in education didn't even begin to think through the consequences of Circular 600.
4. The 1947 Report was hardly even read! People in the Scottish Education Department picked out what suited them, and ignored what did not. It was a Report that had hardly any impact.
5. A combination of the fact that Labour policies were in the ascendant, and so the prevailing social philosophy was imbued with that type of thinking - notions of equality and justice for all. These had to be seen to be done, and education was an obvious target to get things on the move.
6. a) They had to ride astride a difficult pair of horses - their political masters on the one hand and the dictates of sound educational theory on the other. They also had to temper the more exuberant extravagances of the Labour Party.

b) In my time, the quality of the Inspectorate has declined markedly. You used not be able to get in without a first class degree. Now entry is not nearly so academically rigorous. So I

think they're a poor bunch of men and women, whose job is to obey the current political whim, and go round schools peddling the latest fad, or what has impressed them in other schools. I don't think they're listened to very much. They often push an idea without being in the slightest aware of its practical implications.

c) Too many headteachers are keen to jump on the latest band-wagon. In former days, the headteacher had the proper authority and full responsibility to do his job as he saw it. Now there is too much interference from outsiders for him to be able to do this.

d) In general they obeyed the party line. I do not think that they gave education much real or serious thought.

e) I do not think that in general advisers had a great influence. In fact they were basically powerless and ineffectual, and dependent on teachers to implement their ideas. Some of them used the job as a stepping stone into the inspectorate or headships.

7. The main obstacle to the implementation of a comprehensive policy was the tradition of many good Scottish senior secondary schools. But in the end the politicians won the day, and despite offering resistance, many fine schools (both fee-paying and state incidentally) were submerged without trace. There has undoubtedly been a steady downhill change in all aspects of secondary schools in the last decade or so.

8. Headteacher had complete latitude in the early days, but the room

for manoeuvre has been recently restricted as I have been told.
No one told me what to do.

9. I don't think there was an outwardly vocal reaction to the shift. Teachers in general just got on with their job very much as usual. Strong reaction only surfaced when they were pushed too far.
10. Undoubtedly the main implication of Circular 600 was that heads and principal teachers had to work out how to make it work in schools - so this raised questions of grouping of children, curriculum and assessment.
11. It varied from school to school, even department to department. So much depended on the philosophy and outlook of heads and principal teachers. That dictated how much change took place.
12. In-service training played some part, especially where subjects were having their syllabus violently altered. But remember that not all teachers go on courses - so effects are bound to be patchy.
13. Again the reaction was mixed. For a long time the Headteachers' Association of Scotland contained only senior men in the profession - the heads of good established schools. They tended to be suspicious of the younger men who were appointed to headships after the move to comprehensive schooling.

The Headteachers' Association of Scotland was - and presumably still is - a forum for the exchange of ideas. A lot of

incidental and fortuitous learning goes on at its meetings. You usually find that, apart from outside speakers who deal with the issues of the day, most of the business centres on the practical issues of school management and administration. It had access to the powers that be, but usually didn't initiate much. It usually reacted to events, or had its opinion sought on proposed initiatives e.g. new exams, syllabuses etc.

14. Comprehensive schools certainly did away with the clear-cut distinction. In the new set-up it was at least theoretically possible to move from one course to another, the same as used to happen in rural omnibus schools. Junior secondary schools in cities were often too big to be effective, and filled with children who had been eternally damned by their performance in the rather rigorous qualifying or control exam.
15. A good deal, but usually in respect of new syllabus, exams, or curriculum content. Not many teachers in my experience go in for deep questioning of what they do in class.
16. In rural areas the comprehensive school was accepted more, and probably attempted in a better way than in urban areas. A lot there depended on the catchment area, e.g. Bearsden and Easterhouse - which very much controls what you can attempt.
17. There has always been a confusion between equality of opportunity and equality of ability. Manifestly all men are not created equal. I think it means that you give all children the opportunity to achieve their potential, and keep doors open as

long as possible. This confusion unfortunately has tended to restrict the able pupils' full development. By putting the emphasis on extending opportunities to all pupils, teachers' time was inordinately taken up with average or less able pupils, so that the able couldn't get the curriculum or teaching they deserved. Why should an able child be restricted to seven Ordinary grades or 4 'Highers' if it can easily cope with nine and seven respectively?

18. Undoubtedly, as many Labour Party members sent their own children to selective schools, including those on the Education Committee, which was publicly advocating comprehensive schools. How do you explain that contradiction?
19. The major notion they had to come to terms with was the common course, and teaching some subjects to pupils who had never been in their subject before. Remember James Robertson's reference to Procrustes and his bed in the 1947 Report!
20. An old fashioned higher grade school like the omnibus or multilateral school, in which you allocated children to groups on the basis of their primary reports into 2 language/one language/no language/, but built-in ease of transfer if latent ability showed up subsequently. Children at 12 should be seen as ripening apples - the colours of which change at different rates.

SOME THOUGHTS ON GLASGOW'S SELECTIVE SCHOOLS

The existence of fee-paying/selective schools caused a considerable obstacle to comprehensive policy. Parents got either what they paid for

or what the ability of their children allowed them to get. They were widely socially representative, the criterion of entry being ability, so as such they must have deprived comprehensive schools of some able pupils. We always tried to ensure that all our pupils left with the best leaving certificate it was possible for them to obtain.

Yes, both types of school can co-exist because you must have schools to stretch the most able. Comprehensive schools cannot offer a wide enough curriculum for these pupils, because they are spreading all their resources evenly for all pupils.

The selective issue went to House of Lords, because of the very strong feeling the whole issue generated among parents and staff. The Government made a commitment then ratted on it. We were sold down the river by Gordon Campbell, the Secretary of State. The irony is we got more honest support from Willie Ross.

Councillors were united in public, but in private it was a different matter. All these moves to put the squeeze on private education are best seen as sops to Labour Party ideology - to let it appear in public that fee-paying schools were being damaged, or at least inhibited in some way, at the expense of state schools. We had to charge these fees, because the corporation removed our grant for our playing fields at Anniesland - another sop. But since it was only for social, cultural and recreational facilities, it was not as important as our enemies made out.

Parents were consulted not at all, they were told what had been decided. That's why there was such intense feelings and public outcry.

Councillors acted like omniscient dictators.

Integration was out because private schools wanted their independence, so the possibility of integration with the state sector was always a non-starter. The selective heads challenged the Director because the Education Authority had failed in its duty to honour the commitments it had made, and began to adopt a series of delaying tactics to prevent selective intakes to the 5 schools.

The biggest problem with the comprehensive schools is that they neglect the lads o'pairts. As I said, by the pressure on staff and resources to cater for all pupils, especially the unable, they could not possibly do their best for the high flyers.

It is also the case that some comprehensive schools actually perpetuate social divisions, because of the social composition of some catchment areas. Also, I am sure that in some areas, able children are victimised for their ability out of jealousy, which results either in disruption or their imitating or being dragged down by the less able majority. There is no doubt, in my mind that a selfish attachment to socialist theories was a mistake. Many excellent schools were sacrificed for Labour Party dogma. We shall never see their like again.

I would highlight these points which distinguish selective schools from state schools:

- 1) The complete habit of work.
- 2) Breadth and flexibility of the curriculum in view of pupils' needs and abilities.
- 3) Discipline and training, both in school and extra curricular

activities.

- 4) The possibility of using the school's name - the 'old-boy' network if you like. But, I think that is perfectly legitimate, given such schools' tradition and reputation.

1. The main initiatives came from England. Comprehensive reorganisation was an English solution to an English problem - the shortage of grammar school places. It is true that some teachers were dissatisfied with the junior secondary/senior secondary divide in Scotland, but here was no public outcry about it. Comprehensive education was essentially seen as making a grammar school education more widely available, and because central policy for Scotland and England is the same, it came up here.
2. The moves were primarily political. In general, there was no intense feelings for change, certainly not in senior secondary schools. Although the move to comprehensive schools was advantageous for some existing schools, it was generally felt to be a bad move educationally.
3. The 1947 Report was well-written, full of jewels of expression on matters educational. In terms of philosophy it was far-seeing, and came at a time of interest in educational change after the holocaust of war. But change in education takes a long time, so very little was done about its recommendations. Some of its ideas were very new.
4. There was in the 1960's a political searching for the panaceas for the ills of society, and education was looked on as a way to give opportunities and chances in life to a larger number of pupils.

5. The major implication of Circulars 600/614 was undoubtedly the widening of the ability group and social mix among pupils that teachers had to deal with. It caused serious problems and much discontent in some schools, especially the old established senior secondary schools. In the early days, you must remember, there were not the number of committees that came later, so teachers were isolated in their own schools. It was a dramatic change, which each school was largely left to sort out as it saw fit. It was a more promising line of development for the junior secondary school, although in my opinion, junior secondary pupils lost out in the comprehensive system.
6. a) Her Majesty's Inspectors had an important role as always. A number of Her Majesty's Inspectors at the time were far-seeing individuals who had a firm grasp of what was needed for curricular change.
- b) In the West of Scotland, most local politicians were unanimously in favour of the change to comprehensive schools, but they did not influence schools or developments directly. Any influence they had was indirect, through the Directorate staff.
- c) The influence of Directorate staff varied with the individual. Essentially, they carried out the decisions of the politicians as well as they could in the circumstances which obtained at the time. Problems like staffing and finance loomed so large that any educational ideas or input became obscured.
- d) The educational/curricular side of things was left to the advisers. They had more time, and were very helpful in drawing attention to new developments. e) The Consultative Committee

on the Curriculum did not have a great deal of impact in my time. It was a remote body which made recommendations, but many teachers felt it was at several levels removed from the classroom, and therefore largely irrelevant to their work.

7. The main obstacles to the introduction of comprehensive education as I saw them were:
 - chronic staff shortage at a crucial time
 - buildings, although Glasgow's school building programme was imaginative. But mergers of senior secondary/junior secondary buildings in the main were not successful
 - teacher attitudes, many of which were not favourable to the new developments.
9. Heads had total latitude. Given the intake in some areas, it was impossible to do anything other than have a comprehensive school. It was a problem that could not be brushed under the carpet. I would say that headteachers tackled the implications with varying degrees of enthusiasm. Many still continued to practice selection within their schools, although pressures to avoid it from the Directorate got stronger as time went on.
10. In middle class areas, people were suspicious of the reasons behind the switch to comprehensive education. The main worry was that the influx of difficult/dull pupils would have an adverse effect on the abler children. I don't remember many people saying it was a good thing. Many people had reservations. People in peripheral housing estates were generally in favour.

11. a) I think that the existence of both private schools and area
+
b) schools in housing estates did have an effect on the development of comprehensive schools. In any school, the number of able pupils dictates the pace and work and its success in Scottish Certificate of Education exams. This factor is important in a school's status and reputation.
12. There was not much change to start with. There were strong
+
15. pressures to keep on going as before, especially in schools which had a sound academic reputation. The integration of different pupil types proved difficult.
13. In-service training was definitely beneficial, even if only at the level of enabling teachers to meet and exchange views.
14. a) There were a surprising number of heads who were enthusiastic about comprehensive schools. Not many were violently against it, and most attempted to give it a try within the circumstances obtaining in their own schools.
16. a) The common course was universally adopted. Very few schools coped successfully with mixed-ability classes, which stopped at varying points. The norm was mixed-ability for secondary 1, but some form of grouping by ability took place in secondary 2. Much depended on the subject in question and on class size.
- b) By secondary 3/4, pupils had been well and truly sorted out into ability groups, because of the fierce pressure of Scottish Certificate of Education exams.

17. a) The move to a comprehensive system affected the curriculum a bit, although it took a long time. Even as we speak, it has not been properly sorted out.
- b) Methods too were affected, but much was left to individual teachers. The management approach in schools, coupled with in-service training brought about an interaction of ideas.
18. Yes, teachers have been almost forced to scrutinise their ideas. It might even be argued that the pendulum has swung too far, with too many meetings and a reduced amount of teaching.
19. A lot of schools in smallish Scottish towns were comprehensive schools, but it was a new idea altogether in the 1960's in cities. In addition, the fact that between 30 and 40% of children got in to senior secondary schools in Scotland was seen as very fair, so the gulf between senior secondary/junior secondary schools was not so wide.
20. Equality of opportunity, in the minds of most people, was taken in terms of the chance to sit Scottish Certificate of Education exams. As I have said, there was not a strong perception of inequality in Scotland.
21. A comprehensive school is one in which a group of pupils of
+
22. widely varying abilities is given the best possible chance of achieving tangible success in terms of whatever abilities they may have. Ideally, it should enable every child to show that it can achieve something.

Ability of whatever kind should receive recognition. But we have failed to create attainable goals for all. The main obstacle has been the inability to create a proper curriculum and assessment procedures to match. Hopefully Standard grade will be a move in the right direction.

1. The prime movers were Mackintosh and the politicians in Glasgow. He went on visits with some headteachers to London and then came back determined to introduce a comprehensive system in the city. He set up a building committee to look at the physical requirements of schools in relation to the curricular and organisational changes that the new system would require. The embryo of the idea was with the Director, who then released a current of thought. There was very little push for a comprehensive pattern among headteachers and educationists.
2. The educational and the political overlap. The Butler Act created a whole movement for change in social policy, with the emphasis on equality and opportunity for all. The Labour Party took this up, and pushed it, as it accorded with their philosophy. However, the influence of educational theorists and philosophers should not be discounted, as they popularised the ideal of making education available to all, and not making it the sole prerogative of the intellectually able. In many junior secondary schools, pupils were just written off, and never got a chance. In fact, you could say that a lot of the push for the establishment of comprehensive schools came from a widening realisation of the failure of junior secondary schools, and a reaction against branding children as failures at 12.
3. The ideas of this outstanding Report had been fermenting for a while in the educational world. It was a classic, and clearly ahead of its time. It was taken up by the Australians and made

the basis of the Queensland education service. It was not adopted here because the Scottish Education Department were thirled to an elitist view of the function of schools and a rigid belief in certificate exams. The Chief Inspector at the time brushed it aside and killed it stone dead. It was not acted upon, or given a high public profile. As such, it never became the subject of public or staffroom discussion. Its emphasis on assessment and exam techniques was to influence members of the Dunning Committee years later.

4. It has to be seen as part of a wider canvas of social change. It was the era of plenty consumerism, opportunity, expansion - c.f. 'you've never had it so good'. There was a fresh emphasis on liberalisation of the old, pop music and youth culture were 'in'. A new age was dawning. The old had to be discarded. 'Practicality' and 'relevance' were the 'in' concepts.
5. It did not cause a big turmoil, but rather engendered uncertainty or suspicion about what was happening. With amalgamations of schools there was a fear of loss of promotion prospects among teachers. Then, after a few years, came the Green Paper and the guidance structure. The emphasis was on a management approach to running schools. The biggest furore was about the social engineering aspects of the change. In the early years after the changeover, the heads ran their 'comprehensive' schools like two separate worlds - junior secondary and senior secondary. The idea of using the school's timetable to bridge the gap between the two sets of pupils only came after a while. The noises being made about mixed-ability and the common course worried people. I

would say that the principles of comprehensive education were not implemented in general in schools with any great willingness or enthusiasm.

6. a) It depended on the personalities, but Chirnside and Gatherer seemed to be staunch advocates of the comprehensive school in the Inspectorate.
- b) Although the majority actually were not very clear about what it all meant, they spread the word because it sounded the right thing to say. It was party dogma in other words. The main concern of the elected representatives was getting new schools built and upgrading old ones. They had no clue about the educational implications or the practical problems which faced the schools.
- c) My impression was that many advisers were sticky about it, and paid lip service to it. Only one or two took its implications seriously, and considered the role of in-service and timetable flexibility. Raising of the school leaving age killed the effects of the Brunton Report. Many reports of the period required a management and organisation which just wasn't there, and then any change in Scottish education inevitably encounters a formidable bulwark: academic principal teachers.
- d) Most of the Directorate staff are good administrative men who always gave me my head. They dutifully carry out the policy of the Education Committee, but they generally show little creative urge in terms of the quality of the service that is provided for the community. Mackintosh was an educational crusader, exceptional among administrators in that he actually had an

educational philosophy which he tried to act out. This is not common: in general, Directorate staff have a fear of the Education Committee. They are bureaucrats with administrative rather than educational preoccupations.

- f) The Consultative Committee on the Curriculum was a consultative body which tried disseminate ideas, many of which were never acted upon with any seriousness or sincerity. It laid the ground and made suggestions for others to take up, but it never really faced up to the implications of a proper comprehensive system of schools. It scratched the surface, but dodged the central issues. In fact, these are still being dodged. The subtle influence of past traditions is still perceptible.

7. The main problems were:

- Principal teachers with an academic background
- The Scottish Certificate of Education exams
- Teacher reluctance of apathy
- Parental wariness among the middle class. (Parents of kids who would have gone to junior secondary were glad of the opportunities now available)
- Inadequate buildings.

9. There was never any interference as long as you looked after the interests of your Ordinary and Higher pupils. You could experiment to your heart's content with less able pupils. You were never given targets at which to aim, never made aware of any overriding policy. It was very much each to his own taste.

10. The parental reaction varied with the ability of the child - either one of worry or relief.
11. Nothing very much happened in the mid to late 60's. The real root idea of the comprehensive school was the integration of all pupils into an organic whole by creating outlets for all capabilities whatever these turned out to be. This version of the comprehensive school just did not happen in many schools. Perhaps it was too much to expect. The result is that the key issues and implications of Circular 600 have been ducked for years. The power of the hidden control of schools by exam syllabuses, and the related fact that success - for pupils and schools - is measured only in exam passes, have both militated against the establishment of a real comprehensive system. Noises of change were made, but they tended to be superficial. Basic structures of the schools were untouched.
12. No not really. The press always made much of 'ghetto' schools. They were played up instead of down. I admit that there probably was social pressure to a degree on able children in housing schemes, but my experience was that it merely reinforced their desire to get on and escape.
13. The changes were gradual - first in secondary 1/secondary 2, then raising of the school leaving age, then guidance. A lot of new things were being thrown at schools. It was an unsettling period.
14. They came into their own around the mid 70's. They did much to

change the content of what was taught - old subjects were revamped and new subjects were introduced, change was in the air.

15. Fee-paying schools were pinpricks on the map and did not make a big impact. Their effect was not significant on state schools. We lost more pupils to the private sector.
16. On the whole, headteachers were reactionary. There were only a few genuine enthusiasts; the majority were for it in principle, but in practice they carried out selection according to ability, while claiming their schools were 'comprehensive'. We discovered this when preparing for the 1973 'Macaulay Report' on the implications of raising of the school leaving age.
17. At the outset, most schools were really two schools. Pressure to change came a few years later, especially at secondary 1/2 level. It was only after raising of the school leaving age that headteachers began seriously to grapple with the idea that all children had to have a chance of developing themselves across the whole range of subjects. Raising of the school leaving age certainly blurred the edges, and despite talk of being a disaster, it actually forced people to think.
18. There should be mixed-ability groups for one year, then setting or broad banding in secondary 2.
19. i) The ongoing changes were influenced by the fact that schools were now comprehensive, but this was rarely admitted to.

- ii) Yes, the Scottish Certificate of Education Examination Board made big strides in syllabus changes and techniques of examining. I do not think many changes took in how teachers actually taught in class. There was a powerful teacher resistance. The change in methods was sporadic, but there was a gradually increasing awareness of RELEVANCE and SKILLS in daily practice.
20. Any real scrutiny was confined to a small band of enthusiasts. There was nonetheless a gradual shift from the predominantly academic bias of much that went on. I would say that the arrival of the comprehensive school definitely acted as a catalyst to what happened in schools. Schools would not be as they are now had it not been for the issue of Circular 600.
21. It caused people to question the practical relevance of an overwhelmingly academic and literary curriculum. The omnibus tradition - with its rigid separation into ability stream - did make the shift to a comprehensive school less of a hurdle in Scotland.
22. a) The old lad o'pairts view - if you were able in an academic sense you had to have the opportunity to get an education, irrespective of the personal or family sacrifice involved. The notion of developing a painter, musician, joiner or technician to their potential was an alien concept to the traditional Scottish teacher in senior secondary schools.
- b) Yes, quite definitely. The comprehensive endeavour was never totally wholehearted among Labour Party members. They were content to see to it that schools were provided, but, since they

had not in general thought out what it meant, they were quite happy to allow heads and their staffs to get on with it.

23. The social engineering was a by-product. The key issue was, or ought to have been, an attempt to provide a range of courses to bring pupils of differing abilities and aptitudes to their peak. That is what makes a comprehensive school. Any increased social/political awareness engendered among pupils through proximity with other 'classes' is a healthy and desirable offshoot of the educational basis of the school. I think, incidentally, that such an awareness has been increased by comprehensive schooling.

24. How could anyone answer 'yes' to that question? Once the political/social origin of the comprehensive schools fades from the public consciousness, and they are seen as resources for the community working with other sections of the education service for the benefit of all, they will flourish. Schools cannot function in isolation; a widening conceptualisation is called for. The 16-18 Action Plan may just be the answer - or part of it.

1. I was not conscious of moves to introduce comprehensive education. It was introduced on the instructions of the Scottish Education Department through the Director's office. Most people believed it would be a better and fairer system and were hopeful that it would promote social justice. There were feelings of hope and optimism in society. Everybody had to have equal opportunities and access to whatever they wanted. So the comprehensive movement in education suited the mood of the times.
2. The 1947 Report was always referred to and quoted, but was hardly known by or actively discussed by teachers.
3. The moves to introduce comprehensive education were certainly political, but were accepted by both parties. There was an educational aspect to them: the sense of injustice at the split between junior secondary/senior secondary schools, and the resultant obvious misplacement of many pupils. Pupils in junior secondary schools were passing Ordinary grade exams. Both in --- Secondary and ----- Secondary pupils were rigidly streamed into Scottish Certificate of Education, junior secondary 1, junior secondary 2. The fact that all pupils were in one building removed the social stigma attaching to segregated secondary provision. People fell into two camps: a) those who went for mixed-ability groups/group methods. But you would have had to have a school of genius-level teachers to do this well. Mixed-ability teaching ignores reality. b) Those who streamed believing it to be the best and most efficient way to provide

education according to age, aptitude and ability.

4. There was a rising contempt for authority in society. It was the age of 'Flower Power' and 'doing your own thing'. There was also a powerful youth cult in a commercial sense. 'Experts' in education began to talk about more freedom in education, creativity, self-expression. You were encouraged to nurture what was there, rather than force what was not. This new philosophy seemed crazy to many teachers.
5. The main implication was that delicately-nurtured senior secondary teachers were suddenly exposed to hooligans the like of which they had never seen. They were thrown into a bear-pit, and brought face to face with an alien culture. The new doctrine of integration inside schools was just a non-starter. Faced with large numbers and totally unsuitable teaching materials (i.e. books), teachers stuck to what they knew: an academic curriculum with pupils streamed like mad. Really you had senior secondary and junior secondary schools running in tandem in the new schools. Poorer pupils were simply given a watered-down, grammar-based academic education with wholly inappropriate materials. The thinkers among teachers slowly began to realise things would have to change. Apart from Technical, Home Economics and Business Studies, less able pupils had a poor quality of curriculum. Circulars 600/614 threw everything into the melting pot. They merely consolidated what had become apparent to thinking teachers some years earlier.
6. a) Her Majesty's Inspectors are now faceless civil servants, but

then they were people of high calibre. They were the most intelligent men I had ever met. They led the field in curriculum change. They saw the national picture, and were able to pick the leading lights from among the thinking teachers they encountered. They were like captains of good ships sailing upon uncharted seas in search of a new educational world.

- b) Councillors had no influence once it all got started. They had got what they wanted, and were happy that the comprehensive school had arrived. Justice had been seen to be done.
 - c) Directorate staff merely followed Scottish Education Department guidelines. They provided local responses to national initiatives. Their job is to implement and administer educational ideas imposed by other people.
 - d) Her Majesty's Inspectors are like an episcopal hierarchy in education. Advisers are like local Inspectors in a way, but they go out and spread educational ideas to the masses. Your average teacher doesn't give twopence for advisers. Most are disappointing figures who do not figure in teachers' consciousness. They lack the authority, detachment and credibility they should have, hence they have neither clout with nor respect from teachers. They are mostly earnest triers who grow old in the job and run out of steam trying to facilitate.
7. Headteachers had total autonomy. Unless you were doing something obviously crazy or palpably criminal, you could do what you liked. You could experiment with the curriculum or not as you chose. Even when the backwoodsmen came under Inspector/adviser pressure, many still held out. A lot of headteachers 'did the

comprehensive thing', because they felt they had to make it work, irrespective of their own ideas. Despite what they said in public though, they were never really at home with the new order. They put a brave face on it. Any teachers who really did believe in comprehensive education were quickly promoted, because the Directorate needed them.

8. Parents greeted the move with enthusiasm. Since the vast bulk of the population are of junior secondary calibre, they believed in the great white hope enshrined in the comprehensive school. But equally, it created false expectations in many parents, many of whom had aspirations well in excess of their childrens' mental capacities. Parents were largely responsible for getting many 4 year comprehensive schools upgraded to 6 year status. Their argument was: if my son/daughter is so good, why do you want to move him to another school a few miles away?
9. St. Mungo's, Notre Dame and St. Aloysius produced several generations of Catholic professionals, especially teachers. They were like jewels in the crown, and existed to educate the clever sons of Catholic/Irish Artisans. The Catholic community had a soft spot for these schools, and the involvement of Holy Orders with them gave them an aura of respect. Parents looked to them to ensure that their children had a better future than they had. Many people in education resented the creaming that went on in order to send primary pupils to these schools. Then there was the small virulent group of middle class parents who fought their demise tooth and nail, seeing the creeping cancer of the comprehensives as a retrograde step, which meant that their kids

would have to associate with those from deprived backgrounds.

10. The success of any school depends on its intake. To that extent, area schools in some parts of the city had no chance. They were engaged in a constant battle to get kids to school, never mind teach them. Their work also had a large social work element. Unfortunately, the bottom line is that schools are judged by Outsiders, whose sole criterion is academic. Hence, Scottish Certificate of Education results are important. Look at the recent interest in Scottish Certificate of Education 'league tables' in the press.

11. Things weren't too bad to start with. Most people gradually got used to the new order and adapted as best they could. But then came a disastrous setback: the political decision to raise the leaving age in 1972. Up till then not much fundamental change had taken place, but problems really came out into the open with raising of the school leaving age - truancy, indiscipline, inappropriate curriculum, children being forced into subjects they really didn't want to take, vandalism, violence etc. For the first time teachers had to face and cater for hordes of unwilling conscripts.

13. The extent to which reform was introduced within schools in terms
+
14. of grouping children etc depended entirely on the headteacher. They either separated out the pupils at the very start, or allowed mixed-ability or broad-banding for varying lengths of time. Some allowed mixing of ability for subjects like P.E, R.E, guidance etc., but most heads and principal teachers segregated

according to ability for academic subjects. A lot of resources and effort went into work with kids doing Ordinary or Higher. The large two thirds who were not, never really got any co-ordinated curriculum provision. Things like Brunton, City and Guilds, Craft Courses etc., depended almost entirely on individual teacher enthusiasm. The quest for relevance for the curriculum of these kids has never really succeeded.

16. There was again a great deal of variation in how much teachers changed their approaches. A lot of in-service courses were preaching to the converted, who were there out of a personal interest and genuine desire to help their pupils, or to enhance their chances of promotion. Many courses were a well-meaning waste of time. They provided a forum for meeting fellow-sufferers. The intentions were good, but the format left a lot to be desired. Their benefit and impact was out of proportion to the money and effort expended on them.

17. It was a natural follow on in the sense that all pupils went to
+
18. the same school. That part was easy to accept in Scotland. But it was the very antithesis of the lad o'pairs tradition of equality of opportunity in a strictly academic sense. There was no tradition of doing the best for everyone, no matter what their ability. If that was part of a comprehensive school, then it most certainly did not articulate with Scottish educational practice.

19. I would say a comprehensive school should combine a caring element for the disadvantaged, with giving an opportunity to all

pupils who can demonstrate their abilities to develop them, and not just in the examination room. Having said that, the reality is that natural 'camps' break out due to dress, language and background. Pupils segregate themselves, and very little social mixing takes place. What you can achieve thus has to be a compromise.

20. No. Raising of the school leaving age spread the cancer right through the system. The plain fact is that there are conceptual and non-conceptual pupils. Facts are facts, but there was a naive and mistaken belief that the comprehensive school would sort this out. The two thirds majority of our pupils we failed. We never got it right for them. The issues were never really faced. If schools are to have any hope at all it must be through relevance and interest in what is on offer, not through formal teaching in classrooms, with books and studying. Trying to make all pupils swallow formal education is to miss the point, or make the assumption that this what they all want. This is why such an inordinate time is spent keeping order and dealing with the social problems of the deprived kids, so that the able minority can get peace to study.

1. The source of initiatives for introducing comprehensive education was entirely political, but there were educational/social undertones. There was a mounting feeling of unfairness that children were being labelled and categorised for all time far too soon. Many people in Scotland saw the 'new' idea merely as an extension into urban areas of a type of schooling that had existed for centuries in this country.
2. I would say that the moves were a mixture, but primarily political.
3. The 1947 Report was a seminal document born of the post-war euphoria of Atlee's administration. There was going to be fairness and equality for all in society, one aspect of which was to be education according to age, aptitude and ability. But no one read it in 1947. Change in education takes a long time: the history of raising of the school leaving age is a good example.
4. When the forces returned after the war they were filled with hope for a better tomorrow. These grew up strong feelings of equality - 'my kid's are as good as the next man's', etc. So when their children were going through secondary education in the 1960's, there was a parental determination and expectation to see that the kids got every chance. Comprehensive education was in tune with this sentiment.
5. One of the main implications of Circular 600 was a vast programme

of building of large schools which created a promotion band-wagon for teachers. But the buildings - even the new ones - were not very revolutionary in their layout. The educational discussions about comprehensive schools, and concepts like the community school came much later. Many people remained thirled to old ideas and practices for a long time.

6. a) I have a low opinion of Her Majesty's Inspectors They are the yes men of the civil servants, who reflect the views of the political party in power. So, at the time when comprehensive education was introduced, they promulgated it forcefully. It was they who introduced ideas like mixed-ability teaching and the common course, not teachers or politicians.
- b) Local politicians pushed comprehensive schools, both because they genuinely thought it was a good idea, and because it was a way to popularity and votes. They did not have much awareness of what it was all about, and entrusted the implementation to teachers.
- c) Directorate staff pushed it to get support for their building programme. Many in the West of Scotland were subjected to political pressure to change. It solved a lot of problems of management. Many of the Directorate staff were committed to the idea in theory, but were in private sceptical, given their own background.
- d) The expansion of the advisory service was related to the development of comprehensive education. I have a healthy contempt for advisers who are general band-wagon men who promote a system they have not practised. They were created to provide a corps of expert practitioners to provide help for schools in

coming to terms with curriculum development.

- e) The Consultative Committee on the Curriculum got off to a slow, very permissive start, made up as it was of hand-picked people chosen for their respectability. Now they issue dictats and have moved from pronouncing on generalities to specifics.
7. The private sector vitiates the comprehensive principle, but in terms of numbers of pupils involved it has no effect. The major obstacle is professional traditionalism, and in my view that is a good thing. Schools are purveyors of society's traditions and ensure that moves to not change overnight. Things change slowly, and that is as it should be. Change has to be professionally acceptable before it is implemented. The word gradually filtered down from the enthusiasts like Gardner who went round giving talks all over the place. People gradually began to listen. Junior secondary schools were not an obstacle, although they got a bad name, despite being good for that section of the population. Also at that time money/resources were found in plentiful supply.
9. Headteachers had a free hand. There was never any hint of 'thou shalt do such and such'. Directorate could drum up an Inspector to go in and try to effect change by having a quiet word. I am not an ardent comprehensive man, but I was known to be an effective administrator who would probably run a good school, and give it a fair try. Some schools in Glasgow were still running as senior secondary schools well into the 70s because their heads refused to budge along the comprehensive road.

10. A lot of parents in Scotland thought we had comprehensive schools anyway. So most were favourable. In reality there has always been a difference between urban and rural education in Scotland.
11. The percentage of children who attend private schools in the West of Scotland is so small that it has no perceptible effect on the state system. Local authority housing policy dictated that schools had to be built to cater for the local population. They just got on with it.
12. Internal changes were very slow to happen and sometimes very painful for some teachers.
13. In-service training was a big help to those teachers that were enthusiastic enough to go, and hardened the attitudes of the cynics who were very critical of what was provided. In-service had to battle against a very stolid philosophy which was vastly different from what it was trying to achieve. To be fair, also, some people did change their outlook, like the people in Goldsmith's 'Village Schoolmaster' who came to scoff but stayed to pray.
14. a) The vast majority of heads liked the idea because it made their school the equal of others - all schools were 'comprehensive'. They all, however, had their own ideas about what a comprehensive school was.

b) Teacher reaction was very mixed. The old brigade faced many formidable changes. Some teachers liked the freedom associated

with new ideas, syllabuses etc., but found that the organisational implications of proper comprehensive provision were very complex. Teachers' background and training were not of much help in dealing with the new system.

15. To start with, for several years, 'comprehensive' schools were senior secondary and junior secondary schools under one roof, but operating separately. Gradually, it came to be realised that bringing all children under one roof had implications that had not been foreseen - and that's when ideas like the common course and mixed-ability classes began to appear. But again people were left to put their own interpretation on these terms, and work them out in practice as they thought best.
17. The advent of the comprehensive school had a big effect on both the curriculum and teaching methods. But the basic paradox of the common course is that at the end of it you have to sort children out. I wonder sometimes if we have got it right yet?
19. The comprehensive school encapsulated Knox's idea of the school in every parish. The Scottish idea of education also accorded perfectly with raising of the school leaving age - a perfect example of the comprehensive principle - education for all. But the idea of equal treatment for all in a school was very radical in Scotland. So I would say that the comprehensive school was radical in theory, but not, as it has turned out, in practice. It is the sensible partner of Scottish life and society.
22. The comprehensive school has not reached its potential.

Extraneous factors have intervened at all stages - shoddy buildings, staff shortage, cut-backs, government changes of policy (e.g. placing requests), split Roman Catholic schools, falling rolls. Teacher attitude has sometimes also caused problems. No long-term view was taken. It was very much an ad-hoc policy to problems that arose.

**PAGE
NUMBERING
AS ORIGINAL**

1. The idea came from Her Majesty's Inspectors and it was rapidly taken up by Labour - controlled councils in Scotland. The original idea came from the 1945 (Scotland) Act. Remember that World War Two was an important factor in effecting changed attitudes in society.
3. The 1947 Report was a seminal document. It laid down ideas which later reappeared in Munn.
2. Comprehensive education was an educational idea taken on board by politicians. Education and politics fused in this issue. There was, however, no strong feeling among teachers in Scotland that the education system should be changed. Experienced people did not apply for posts in the early comprehensives like St. Augustine's and Crookston Castle. Many people didn't want to know. The fact is that the majority of teachers were not enthusiastic about it, a fact which impeded its development.
4. Comprehensive education became attractive in the 1960's because educational ideas had been developing in that direction over several years. Its implementation awaited a suitable economic and financial climate. The Scottish Certificate of Education Ordinary grade success as a national exam was a powerful factor in creating a climate of opinion which eventually accepted that junior secondary schools were wrong. Also, all new schools built in housing estates were designated as area comprehensives. This helped to gain acceptance for the idea. Old senior secondary

schools were left untouched.

5. The main implication of Circular C600 was a gearing down old established senior secondary schools. Junior secondary pupils and staff were seen as an unnecessary and unwelcome addition. Similarly, junior secondary schools were geared up, and the Ordinary grade narrowed the gap between junior secondary and senior secondary schools. The idea of comprehensive schools scared a lot of teachers, and entrenched many in their elitist attitudes to education.
6. The Consultative Committee on the Curriculum was the barking dog of the Inspectorate. The Her Majesty's Inspectors pushed the educational thinking, and the Consultative Committee on the Curriculum promoted their ideas in the curriculum papers. The political allegiance of local politicians coloured their response, and educational officials did their best to implement comprehensive education. They were concerned with the administrative implications. Subject advisers were local message boys who helped to bridge the gap between the Directorate and schools. They merely told the good teachers what they already knew and tried to push reluctant poorer teachers to change. Personally, of course, they were very nice people. Their chief influence was with keen enthusiastic teachers. They had no success with the head-in-the-sand, unreceptive type, who merely erected a brick wall to all new ideas.
7. The chief obstacle to the introduction of comprehensive education was entrenched attitudes. Many principal teachers were excellent

in their day, and had built up formidable reputations based on good Scottish Certificate of Education results. They got respect from younger staff, and probably influenced some of them against the new idea they did not like. Comprehensive education meant something new and different, a hell of a lot of work, and a new type of pupil never before seen by many staff. It was seen as ushering in a period of education of a lower standard.

9. In practice there was a lot of diversity in comprehensive schools. People got away with as much as they could. Heads who wanted change had to go at a snail's pace to avoid revolutions. As far as curriculum and internal organisation were concerned, headteachers had almost total freedom. They got very little specific guidance, and very little backup. This was because Directorate staff had little knowledge or experience of the realities of comprehensive education. The Directorate dealt with general administration - never anything specific. The quality of the staff was a vital factor in the new schools. In purpose-built schools there was a better atmosphere. In the former amalgamated senior secondary schools the atmosphere was hellish.
10. Parents accepted new schools in housing estates as the norm, but felt that the new comprehensive idea would ruin good schools with academic reputations.
11. You just have to accept area schools in housing estates and get on with it. Schools don't need to have a social mix. To have proper comprehensive education private education should be abolished, freedom of choice should go, religious segregation

should end, and poorer areas should get financial priority. If these conditions are not met, the comprehensive school is up against it. But, of course, they are not politically realistic. The comprehensive school has been damned from the start by many harsh realities. There have always been loopholes, ways out. Still, the area school is the ideal unit for education.

12. The blunt truth is that any responsible headteacher did what he could to encourage such developments as his staff would let happen with the resources - human and economic - he had at his disposal. He had no power to remove recalcitrant staff. Innovation found itself up against decades of tradition. The process of change took a long time, and was variable in its extent. It took much longer than the authorities were prepared to admit or allow. We are only now trying to come to terms with the real implications of comprehensive education.
13. Many in-service courses were mutual admiration societies. Only good teachers attended them. The extent to which others were converted by the new ideas picked up by more enthusiastic colleagues was limited. Not much rubbed off. Much praiseworthy work was done, and the courses performed an important function. The Inspectors' functions changed mid-60's. They stopped pronouncing, and began to look for and peddle ideas. Subject panels, advisers and Inspectors all helped teachers to feel less isolated. The increased awareness helped teacher morale. You knew you weren't alone. The Gods became men and chose to talk to us, and gained in stature as a result. This was a great change from the post-war period, when the education was hierarchical,

and schools were told what to do. In the 1960's people were given their head, made to feel they could make a contribution.

14. a) Headteachers were broadly receptive towards comprehensive education, especially later appointments, who had usually been enthusiastic principal teachers and assistant headteachers. Selection was controlled.

b) Teachers were much more hostile, even when headteachers were appointed to 'rock the boat' a bit. The combination of the Directorate and politicians was powerful, and it tried to filter up the 'right' people for senior jobs.

15. There was little integration of junior secondary/senior secondary pupils, and much separation. Many so-called 'comprehensive' schools were essentially senior secondary schools with junior secondary pupils kicking around inside them. The curriculum, option structure, teaching and assessment procedures were academic. Less able kids were tagged on to that, and sometimes had wildly distorted timetables. Also, classes were still designated according to the ability of the pupils. Entrenched conservatism ruled. Also, to be fair, no one knew how to design courses that were appropriate. People were being asked to cope with a situation for which they were ill-prepared, and to which they were strangers.

16. a) Mixed-ability classes caused great tension in schools, because they were seen as a dilution of standards, and a threat to able kids. No suitable courses had been devised for such classes. It was a good idea, but one which cannot be applied in every

subject. It was never really accepted.

b) In secondary 3/4 kids were usually split into certificate/non/certificate classes. The feeling was very much: let's get on with the job for the sake of Ordinary and Higher grade pupils.

17. a) Curriculum change rumbled on and on for years, but it was cosmetic rather than fundamental. It is only with Munn and Dunning that the chickens are coming home to roost.

b) I am not so sure about teaching methods. Just when colleges needed people they were denied the opportunity to recruit them. The best teaching experience was in the schools. Colleges did their best, but under a dreadful handicap - most of their staff hadn't a clue about the internal workings of a comprehensive school.

The Guidance system was an enormously important change. The philosophy in it was much more important than the structures which were set up in its name. A radical idea had been broached - was education academic or social? It's funny how teachers see the term 'academic' as complementary, while others see it as derogatory. As a result of guidance, some teachers were prepared to shift from a teacher-centred to a pupil-centred approach.

19. The comprehensive school was a new concept in towns but not in Scottish small burghs. It is a modern development of the parish school. Socio-economic values changed. There was no longer the same inferiority attached to not having had an education. Older teachers were not aware of this, and clung to traditional

Scottish values.

20. Equality of opportunity was seen in terms of the academic ladder. This was inevitable given the teachers' background and training. In keeping with the Scottish tradition, teachers believed that their best service to the local community was to identify and promote the able pupils.
21. A comprehensive school should serve all the pupils within its area regardless of ability, race, religion, with parental support, to the exclusion of any alternative form of schooling. It should aim at diversity of provision - academic, vocational, aesthetic etc. This is only now beginning to happen. The legacy of our academic past has been hard to shift. The ideal comprehensive school should be a continuation of arrangements in a primary school. Children should select themselves into appropriate courses, not be selected by the school.
22. The potential of the comprehensive school has not been tapped. It has been a long slow process, which has met with quiet resistance. The level of guidance, given the enormity of the change, was dreadful, and the succession of governments we have had merely paid lip-service to the ideal - both ideologically and in terms of finance. Teachers - or most of them - just conducted business as before.

POSTSCRIPT

The atmosphere in education has changed now. There is more overt control of what happens in schools as a result of increased political

intervention. Professional autonomy has been questioned. Much more is imposed from outside e.g. Munn and Dunning. Policy issues are decided outwith schools. These factors have been as important in the recent dispute as pay.

1. Labour Councillors and Members of Parliament were the groundworkers for comprehensive education, and so were certain Directorate staff if they had been convinced. Also, there were in Glasgow pioneering headteachers like Christie, Gardiner and Macrae. Publications like NEW SOCIETY and THE NEW EDUCATION were very influential in creating a climate of opinion.
2. The Report and its contents were supported by those of a socialist or Labour persuasion. Much of it stemmed from the egalitarian thinking propounded by the post-war Atlee government.
3. Strongly political moves. The motivation was almost entirely political. New subjects were introduced (e.g. Russian, Modern Studies), and old ones came under threat (e.g. Latin). There was not much agitation among teachers to introduce a comprehensive system.
4. It was grabbed by those who saw it as a way to change the world, especially if they had not had the opportunity of an education themselves, or had not got to the top. Change was in the air, and with it went a desire for expanding opportunities. Once the band-wagon started to roll, all sorts of people jumped aboard whether they believed in it or not.
5. Junior secondaries were merged with senior secondaries or new schools were built. This had massive implications for internal organisation and teaching.

6. 1) Her Majesty's Inspectors were all for it - the avant garde brigade. They were government servants so they had to toe the line. Their jobs and prospects were at stake.
- 2) The Directorate were in the swim too, pushed along, if unwilling, by Labour politicians. Money was spent like water in Glasgow. You got whatever you asked for, and didn't have to justify it.
- 3) Some advisers were good, but they promoted new things at the expense of old. They pushed the new outlook.
7. Headteachers had complete and total latitude to do as they wanted in their own schools. This suited those who protested about comprehensive plans, the died-in-the-wool academics; some felt pressurised, and were grateful to get out on retiral.
8. The public were mostly for it, except in fee-paying schools, or those who were very middle class. The media 'sold' comprehensive schools in a positive light, as it was government policy. Many landward areas had comprehensive schooling, already, even if that name was not used.
9. There was criticism of their elitist snobbish image, and the fact that they robbed the state schools of many able pupils.
10. Area schools were a problem, because certain schools were bottom-heavy and had too much of the one range of ability and social background. Parents with ambitions in these areas moved if they could afford it to escape the depressing effects of their environment.

11. The obstacles were subtle rather than obvious. There was no outcry of protest, because of Scotland's history of educational provision since the time of Knox. But amidst the euphoria of the new education and the good future prospects it held out for all, there was a deep-seated hatred of change, and a lack of conviction that mixing children of widely differing abilities would work.
12. Some junior secondary schools were very innovative and did good work, others were dreadful. In my view, those that failed did so because the teachers thought that a watered-down senior-secondary course with similar teaching methods 'would do'. In the new comprehensives the old divisions persisted, and suitable courses were not provided for the average and below average pupils. So disenchantment set in. The sort of pioneering work typical of the best junior secondary practice should have been encouraged in the new set up, but it was not. As a result, those children got a worse deal in the comprehensive set up than they would have in a good junior secondary.
13. Streaming still went on as a defence mechanism against the attack on able pupils implicit in notions like the common course and mixed-ability classes. Teachers regarded time spent in a mixed-ability class by able kids as lost. The reversion to streaming was quick.
14. The old system stretched the able to the limit for the benefit of society. In the new set-up, money, energy and time were expended on behalf of the less able at the expense of the able, who tended

to be left to their own devices, hard work and enthusiasm. Those not of determined character must have dropped out through boredom. There should be grouping by ability for the sake of all, with permanent flexibility to correct errors as they are discovered.

15. a) The Curriculum was pruned, there were more new subjects and less time for each. New syllabuses came in as well.

b) There was no marked effect on methods. Money was lavished on hardware and audio-visual equipment to catch the public eye. Chalk-and-talk reigned supreme, and any other method tended to be used passively, or without adequate preparation and follow-up. New fangled things like T.V., tape recorders were seen primarily as recreational rather than as pedagogical aids.

16. a) I don't think very much scrutiny was done. Chalk-and-talk still dominated the approach, and many senior secondary staff hadn't a clue how to deal with children of lesser ability or concentration - things like thematic studies and projects.

b) Good courses were planned, but with an experimental slant. Not all went to them, however, and what was being preached was beyond most of the audience. The courses were supported by those who had joined the band-wagon, and taken by those who had escaped from the classroom and REAL teaching.

17. It was revolutionary: look at the results. So I would say that the move to comprehensives depreciated the value of secondary education in the eyes of many people who had previously held it

in high regard. The move to comprehensive schools was a step back or down, depending on your view. It was a development from something which was universally held to be excellent. The comprehensive disciples tended to dismiss the entire 'ancien régime' and all its facets as bad, so the baby was thrown out with the bathwater. There has to be change, but it must build on rather than attempt to sweep away established traditions. Change has to be controlled.

18. Equality of opportunity in Scotland meant that all the stops were pulled out to enable the bright of whatever background to go to the top. As such, comprehensive schools were not needed. Unfortunately, equality of opportunity for the able was superseded by egalitarianism, by which everyone was supposed to end up the same. Such a view is misplaced, and its effects penalises the clever child. Much depended on the extent to which those in key positions were blinded by the false claims of egalitarianism. Educational problems tended to be treated as social problems.

19. a) This term could be defined both educationally and socially. In the latter sense, it seeks to create a social mix, but you cannot escape the effects of background, ability and inclinations. Educationally, it seeks to meet the full potential of all pupils whatever that may be.

It is doubtful however, whether all children leave our new comprehensives having had an education tailored to their needs which has provided them with some element of pride and self-respect. Most people in Scotland saw the changeover to

comprehensive education in the narrow sense of more children benefitting from the old system. Any progress made was slow. Many teachers resented the imposition of it against their will, and the total absence of prior consultation.

20. The potential has not been tapped because it was tackled in the wrong way. Comprehensive education was presented as a political fait accompli to people who held to old traditional methods and came from an elitist background. Being the successes of the system themselves, it was too much to expect that they could bridge the gap, and get down to the level of children who could not read. Most of the protagonists were not in close touch with education, and thus lacked a true appreciation of problems on the ground. The personality and inclination of the teacher thus became crucial. Because such a rapid and drastic rethink was required, comprehensive education did not get a proper start. It was like asking someone who has never swum to dive in at the six foot end of a pool.

POSTSCRIPT

A caring interest in one's pupils and a concern for their wellbeing and development have long been recognised as one of the hallmarks of the good teacher. This interest was put under a severe strain in the 1960's in the new and expanding city comprehensive schools.

These were larger than ever before, had very mixed intakes in every sense. Both staff and pupils found themselves struggling to establish their identities in this new and confusing educational world into which they had been thrown. Many staff and pupils were insecure, bewildered

and looking for help.

A system of pastoral care was introduced to combat these feelings, to get to know pupils and their parents and home background. The implication was a massive attempt to get to know each pupil's capabilities, potential, background, character, career aspirations, and sundry other strengths and weaknesses.

Change in education is gradual. There is a world of difference between the grand social/educational schemes of the politicians and the headteacher in his own school. Problems are dealt with in a pragmatic manner as they arise. That is how experience is built-up. The result is that nothing is perfect.

Rab Butler started it all after the war. A war concentrates the mind. Its stark realities cause the preconceptions held for generations to begin to tumble. Old attitudes are re-examined. There was an undoubted surge of idealism after the carnage. The comprehensive idea was fine on paper, but in Scotland it was resented because it posed a threat to the lad o' pairts tradition.

Educational reports don't have much effect in schools, either because teachers do not read them, or are too busy with day-to-day realities to consider their implications. You study reports when at college or if you become an administrator.

Teachers in Scotland were not agitating for the introduction of comprehensive schools. It came entirely from outside. There were no in-depth discussions of a serious nature among teachers on the state of the educational system. The only thing that provoked comment was the failure of the junior secondary school. In most of these everything was a problem - an unsuitable, over-academic curriculum, discontented teachers and pupils that had been branded as failures. Difficult to be optimistic there, wouldn't you say?

For a while selective (state and non-state) schools creamed off able pupils, and this had a crippling effect on the newer comprehensive

school. Schools are unfortunately judged by their ability to secure Scottish Certificate of Education passes for their pupils, not by fancy social or political theories. So the new schools had to prove they were as good as the senior secondary ones, to allay the suspicion of their critics.

The Inspectorate went through the motions of pushing the comprehensive school. It would have been a betrayal of their function openly to criticise the new movement. But they all had their private thoughts, of course, just like the rest of us.

Stewart Mackintosh, despite his own educational background (Allan Glen's, 1st class Hons Maths/Physics, Ed B, PhD.) was very much in favour of comprehensive school. Labour Councillors accepted it more because it was official party policy than because they really believed in it. The attraction of the selective school as providing a most useful social function for the able, especially from working class families was very strong.

Headteachers fell into two groups: 1) a small group of enthusiasts who had been promoted for that reason. They went on visits to England on the city's expense account to learn from experiences down there 2) the others steeped to varying degrees in the old traditions. A lot of them were promoted because they had the 'right' degree - usually Classics, Physics/Chemistry, Maths, English, occasionally modern languages - but all academic disciplines.

There were many conferences for headteachers with speakers from all over the place. But really you cannot disguise ability. Pupils know what they can do, and in my opinion you can actually do psychological harm to

a slow child by forcing him to be in the same class as a bright one. You merely emphasise his sense of inferiority. Let's face it: a lot of kids just want to leave school at the earliest opportunity so that they can bring an end to their school life. They do not envy the able, they just want away. This does not of course, mean that schools have no obligations towards them, but schools have never really come up with an answer to how to cater for them. It's an intractable problem which the comprehensive system has accentuated rather than solved. It has been skirted. People have gone through the motions - no more.

The comprehensive school certainly widened rather than changed the curriculum. It hardly changed teaching methods at all. In a sense former low-status subjects have had their position slightly enhanced - Home Economics, Business Studies, Technical, Art. People now realise they all have a role to play in pupils' education, rather than act as repositories for those that cannot do the academic subjects.

Nevertheless you must have differentiation in a comprehensive school. The speed of the fleet is always the speed of the slowest ship - so mixed-ability is not on. It's good for teachers to get bright classes on their timetable - it brightens up the professional challenge.

The word comprehensive has to be defined: do you mean in intellectual terms, or social terms, or both?

I would say that all comprehensive schools have done is made secondary education uniformly acceptable by removing the scourge of the junior secondary school. That stigma has been removed, but note how a lot of Scottish schools still have the word 'Academy' or 'High School' in their name. The word 'secondary school' has not proved as popular here as in England.

A comprehensive school must show it is as good academically as the senior secondary school. That is the criterion of success, and is the only way to disprove the scepticism of the Doubting Thomases. Unfortunately, parents judge schools not on what they can do for all children, but on how good they are at getting the clever ones through Scottish Certificate of Education exams. Consider the recent 'league' tables in the Glasgow Herald. Guidance offered a very good possibility - the introduction of a human dimension, in which it was possible for children to have a relationship with educated adults, rather than see them merely as people who cram them with facts to pass exams.

A WORD ON CATHOLIC SCHOOLS

Catholic parents who adhere to the doctrines of the faith believe that separate schools are necessary to rear their children in an acceptably moral manner. Eternity and destiny are more important than life present. Catholic schools are a bastion against values in modern society that are mimical to morality.

You must also remember that the Catholic population in West Central Scotland came over from Ireland after the 1845 Potato Famine. They were an uneducated, socially-depressed minority. Parents wanted a better life for their children. Catholic orders provided an education which otherwise would not have been there. Hence selective secondary education provided an avenue to social success, and the possibility of a profession for the Catholic Community. It is for this reason that these schools (St. Mungo's, Notre Dame, St. Aloysius) were held to give the 'best' education available. The sentimental attachment of Catholics to them was great.

The need for something like a comprehensive school was much more urgent in England than in Scotland, since a far higher proportion of pupils made it to senior secondary than to grammar school. The omnibus school in any case had a long and familiar history in Scotland. Many of them were famous and respected.

I could perhaps help your study best by giving you some idea how the first comprehensive schools in Glasgow - Crookston Castle and St Augustine's - were set up in 1954. An article in the now defunct 'Evening Citizen', announcing the opening of the new schools, said that headmasters would be 'hand-picked' because of the experimental nature of the schools. In the event, the men chosen were David Mowat and James Murray. The Education Committee took the decision, on Dr MacKintosh's advice, to send these gentlemen with some officials to look at comprehensive developments in England, and get a flavour of what it was like putting comprehensive ideas into practice. (Incidentally, I would place Dr MacKintosh alongside Sir James J. Robertson as the most enlightened Scottish educationists of this century.)

As far as I can remember, visits were made to Anglesey, Birmingham, Southampton and London. All schools visited taught something new, something to be considered when the deputation returned to Glasgow. Armed with this rather scanty experience, the newly appointed heads set out to build their own new Jerusalem in Glasgow's green and pleasant outer fringes. They had the unstinting support of the Director and a succession of sympathetic Education Committee Conveners from Lord Galpern to George Moore. They were given a completely free hand to run

their schools 'within the bounds of sanity'. The principal teachers appointed were, without exception, outstandingly good. Official support remained unaltered for anything that the headteachers wanted to try.

The approach to the remit had nothing to do with political or educational pressures. Reports, memoranda and circulars had no greater impact on the headteacher than on ordinary teachers intent on doing their job to the best of their ability. The approach was heuristic and pragmatic, dealing with problems as and when they arose.

Her Majesty's Inspectors visited both schools after they had been in operation for two years. Almost the entire staff of the Western Division came at once. The headteacher was grilled for a whole afternoon on every aspect of the school - its philosophy, its practice, its difficulties - by all of the Inspectors. The school was never informed of the contents of their report. Open government was then undreamt of.

Local parents were very enthusiastic in their support, very proud of the school and what it was trying to do. Initial requests from parents in the more distant parts of the catchment areas to send their children to a nearer senior secondary school because of family connections with these schools ceased after a year or two, and the comprehensive school just came to be seen as the local school for secondary education.

I do recall a widespread 'over my dead body' reaction among quite a few headmasters and teachers to the idea of the comprehensive school. Oddly enough, as the principle gradually became accepted, some of these were loud in their claims that their schools had always been comprehensive.

A comprehensive school is one which, in the words of Florence Horsburgh, 'is an area school, providing for all its pupils according to age, ability, and aptitude'. In general, my impression was - and still is - that Labour politicians and activists favoured the comprehensive idea. Others looked on it with a cool appraisal.

1. It all started in England where there had been dissatisfaction with the 11+ and secondary modern schools even from the early 1950s.

The whole movement was politically inspired, but it would have happened anyway. It was a natural extension and evolution of developments in the 30s and 40s. In ----- there was a good relationship between the senior secondary and its local junior secondary - ----- . Pupils who turned out to be bright were sent to us as were children from ----- who wished to say on to secondary 5/secondary 6. But there was a palpable resentment in ----- at the changeover. The previous head took early retirement, and both staff and pupils saw the comprehensive set up as changing the old school's identity beyond recognition. People were shattered. They had to change the language they used to talk to junior secondary kids.

2. I would say that the reasons were both educational and political, with strong social motives too.
3. People were sailing along without much thought, and had to be nudged and pushed.
4. It was the swinging sixties. People from humble backgrounds were given hope that, with effort on their part, the opportunities were there for a good life.
5. Buildings were completely unsuitable. Staff, very intellectual

and academic, were antagonists.

6. a) Her Majesty's Inspectors were the servants of their political masters. They picked brains and spread good ideas. There was a change in their attitude from being God-like, fear-inspiring characters, who came to inspect, to a more helpful type of person who gave advice on implementing national policy.
- b) Local politicians were keen because it was Labour Party policy. Their chief influence was in securing 'good' appointments to headships.
- c) The Directorate were helpful, if you asked for help.
- d) Advisers did their best but had no authority.
7. I would say that the main problems were:
- poor buildings
 - lack of adequate resources to fund the policy
 - the attitudes of staff in academic subjects
 - hostile parents who saw the 'nouveau régime' as inferior.
9. Absolute latitude. The prevailing view was: it's your school. Run it as you see fit. So heads just did what they liked.
10. In our area, a lot of parents said 'it's no the same as the old high school'.
11. a) 'Ghetto schools', as they were called, had huge problems before the pupils even crossed the gate.

- b) Private schools had some effect but very slight. For example, --
----- lost 6/300 in secondary 1 to grant-aided or fee-paying schools.
12. Such integration as took place did so in sports, games, opera - extra-curricularly in other words. In subjects they were streamed and separated out according to ability. Pupils separated themselves anyway on social class lines. Guidance didn't have much impact, although its potential was related to the qualities of the staff. Mixed-ability classes were hell. People were creeping in foreign territory. It was traditional teaching, subject setting and removing remedial classes all down the line.
13. In-service helped if only because it let you see that others were suffering the same as you. The lecturers did pass out helpful tips and ideas. Courses were thus good if severely practical. They were morale-boosters. Sometimes there was resentment at class cover.
14. a) Heads got on with it with varying degrees of enthusiasm. The cosy Headteacher Association of Scotland was knocked on the head with an influx of comprehensive and 4 year school heads. It helped to make it a more practical organisation.
- b) Most teachers we knew took to it badly. The young ones were more enthusiastic, but those of an academic frame of mind had nervous breakdowns. They couldn't cope. Those who were Christians or members of the Labour Party felt they had to make the effort and most did.

16. Mixed-ability classes stayed mixed for varying lengths of time. the various forms of layering occurred. Many schools brought back 2 language courses for the most able in secondary 2. Gradually children were sorted out as their ability became evident. ICA was an appalling disaster. An attempt to broaden the scope of education, it was seen as appallingly trivial, and tolerated rather than accepted.
17. I think there were changes in the curriculum - in both subjects and syllabuses but not much change in methods - certainly not in older schools with poorer facilities. Some people changed in that they had to come to terms with dealing with less able children - much harder work than lecturing to rows of pupils in serried ranks.
19. The arrival of the comprehensive school was seen by a lot of people as Scottish education coming full circle. It was like a return to the days of the parish school, or the spreading of the omnibus school idea into city areas.
20. Equality of opportunity in Scotland has tended to be seen as having no obstacles to as much academic success as your ability will allow you. In the old days, there always was the opportunity to shift from a junior secondary to senior secondary stream, but under the comprehensive set up, I think all children lost out - the bright weren't stretched, the middle coasted instead of being driven and the tail-enders were looked after.
21. The comprehensive school was the right form to suit the

educational ideas of the period which had been gradually evolving over the previous decades. But it was spoiled by too much political input: they wanted them to achieve social ends by equalising opportunity and breaking down class barriers. That was just not on!

22. The answer is no, but even 20 years is not long enough for a new idea in education to take root. So there are still a lot of practical problems to be tackled.

1. Initiatives to introduce comprehensive schools were primarily political, and Scotland followed the lead of England where the need for change was greater. There was widespread satisfaction with and acceptance of the system in Scotland, and hardly any members of the profession were pushing for change.
2. Comprehensive schools were the result of political moves and decisions which were then forced on Scottish education.
3. As far as I could see, the 1947 Report had no influence on what happened in schools. It was the 'in' document at Jordanhill in the post-war years. It strongly advocated the omnibus school and segregation by ability. It was not a herald of the comprehensive school.
4. The only thing about the 1960s that made the comprehensive school attractive was that the Labour Party got elected in 1964. This victory intensified the political drive to create a comprehensive system which was seen as being most suited to Britain's needs.
5. The main implication of Circular 600 was that the previously privileged senior secondary sector and the neglected and inferior junior secondary sector had to integrate to form a comprehensive system. It shook up the staid existence of the former, and enhanced the poor status of the latter. It also increased school buildings, and gave teachers new opportunities for promotion.

6. I would say that Her Majesty's Inspectors Directorate staff and advisers all combined to help teachers and headteachers cope with the intake of comprehensive pupils. Local politicians expressed verbal interest, but had little real interest in or understanding of the ideals of comprehensive education or what went on in schools. They often praised the new system at school prizegivings. The Consultative Committee on the Curriculum literature was not widely read by teachers. Some did, some never looked at it. It probably made more impact on advisers who used it for their in-service courses.
7. One of the main obstacles to establishing comprehensive schools in city areas was ensuring a comprehensive intake. Housing and social class composition were fixed, and schools just had to do their best. Also, while younger staff were in general more enthusiastic, many older colleagues had strong reservations to the comprehensive idea. Old antiquated buildings and separate annexes caused many headaches of timetabling and communications. For some years there were huge intakes of pupils. At least in Glasgow, resources were not a problem until Regionalisation. And in the West of Scotland, teacher shortage was endemic. the stigma attaching to old junior secondary schools was never really forgotten.
9. In the early years, headteachers had complete latitude in running their schools, especially over such things as the common curriculum and mixed-ability classes. Experimentation was urged, and welcomed. However, many so-called 'comprehensive' schools graded pupils either on or shortly after entry, based on primary

school reports and Verbal Reasoning Quotient ratings. There was much setting and streaming, in spite of Her Majesty's Inspectors' and adviser advice to the contrary. Vestiges of selection by ability clung on tenaciously in some form. My secondary 2 was set in 1985 when I retired.

10. ----- was a solid working class area and ----- had an excellent reputation. When the old locomotive works closed, many people moved out to the new towns. Many local artisans liked senior secondary education. It had been good enough for them, and they didn't appreciate comprehensive education. It was widely misunderstood as bringing Ordinary grades within the reach of everyone.

11. a) At ---- we lost the equivalent of one whole secondary 1 class to
+
b) the fee-paying sector, especially to the High School. This inevitably affected the academic quality of our top end. Many teachers had their own children at private schools. What happened was that the state schools became perceived as 'good' and 'bad', depending on where they were and how established they were. The assisted places scheme and parental choice have now had the same effect. Area schools never had enough pupils of academic ability.

12. A common pattern in many Glasgow schools was to stream or set or broadband in secondary 1/2, and then have secondary 3/4 split into certificate and non-certificate groups. After 1973, the influence of the Macaulay report began to be felt. This was the first real local attempt at comprehensive provision.

13. There was a superfluity of in-service courses, and many staff were out of school a lot. The advisers and college put in a lot of hard work, but the quality of courses and their impact were variable. On balance though, I would have to say that overall the in-service movement helped teachers to come to terms with the realities of dealing with the comprehensive pupil.
14. a) Most headteachers were in favour of the comprehensive school in principle. A minority - including myself - have never been fully convinced.
- b) Staff reaction correlated with age, in the main. Older staff were set in their ways and tried their best to make it work. But it was a struggle for many.
15. The junior secondary/senior secondary split lasted for many years, and finally got dented by raising of the school leaving age. Many pupils who never had the chance before sat Ordinary grades.
17. The curriculum didn't really change much in my opinion. It was still largely made up of separate subjects. The content and approach in some subjects changed, and some new subjects appeared. New syllabuses and exams also appeared at intervals. Methods changed without a doubt, and this was largely from a need to survive while teaching comprehensive pupils.
18. Most teachers have been forced to rethink their approaches simply to survive. Changes in ideas have resulted from responses to the

challenge of having to cope with comprehensive pupils and of having as pleasant an existence as possible.

19. The comprehensive school was radically new in urban areas, less so in rural areas where the multi-lateral school had a long tradition, though it did not necessarily provide the same education for all its pupils. Personally, I am not sold on the comprehensive school. I think there are other ways to realise equality of opportunity than sending all children to the local comprehensive.
20. Equality of opportunity in Scotland was seen essentially as everyone having an equal chance to work hard, pass exams, and go on to higher education. The comprehensive school provided a fresh start for post-primary pupils to do the same. It was fairer because no one had been labelled.
21. Ideally, a comprehensive school is one which takes in all children from a local area, and gives all the same opportunity to show what they can do. All facilities and resources should be equally shared out. In reality, we tended not to do this. There was a very powerful tradition of protecting certificate pupils at all costs. All pupils should get something out of a comprehensive school and be able to achieve success in something. The aims of a comprehensive school should be wider than purely academic education - e.g. social education, guidance etc. A good guidance system is invaluable in a comprehensive school.
22. I have reservations about whether the comprehensive school had

potential in the first place. Comprehensive education and raising of the school leaving age were both going to bring brave new dawns, but neither has been a spectacular success. The most I would concede is that progress towards comprehensive education has been modest and gradual. It was politically imposed, albeit for worthy social motives, at a time when there was a widespread belief that education could bring about change in society. At heart, its aim was social engineering. But things have not turned out as expected. Expectations of education and what it can achieve were exaggerated, and when they were not fulfilled disenchantment set in. The ideals of comprehensive education have only been approximated to. There is still a long way to go.

**PAGE
NUMBERING
AS ORIGINAL**

1. The unfairness of the separation of pupils at age 12 into junior
+ secondary and senior secondary schools, mainly in the large
2. towns, had been discussed among teachers for many years. There
was a scheme whereby children who did well in junior secondary
could be transferred to senior secondary but, in my experience,
this was not successful. Such pupils usually had to be put back
a year and even then they were not able to keep up with the
class. The feeling of unfairness extended to the Inspectorate,
and then became a political issue in the mid-60s.
4. It must be said that many teachers, even the majority of
teachers, were not in favour of comprehensive education. Senior
secondary teachers did not want to teach less able pupils, and
junior secondary teachers were paid more for teaching what were
known as 'modified' courses to the least able.
5. Circular 600 of 27 October 1965 gave the backing of the Scottish
Education Department and of the Government to comprehensive
education. It advanced the idea that pupils should not be
segregated in senior secondary or junior secondary schools at age
12, nor should they be allocated to certificate and non-
certificate courses on entering the comprehensive school.
Circular 614 of 29 June 1966 took the argument further and
Curriculum Paper No. 2 and 1967 (The Ruthven Report) detailed the
organisation of classes including group teaching with a mixed-
ability class or setting in each subject across a number of
classes.

My 'Notes on Comprehensive Education' of 19 January 1970 collects together statements from various sources which indicate my interpretation of comprehensive education.

When I became headmaster of ----- High School in August 1969, the new school had been in operation for 6 months. Within the one building there were four separate schools which originated in the previous ----- High School (senior secondary), ---- (junior secondary I), ----- (junior secondary II boys) and ----- (junior secondary II girls). Each group of pupils had its own set of teachers. For session 1969-70 the previous headmaster had continued the timetable in such a way that, for my first year, the school had to be run as four separate schools. My remit was to integrate the school into one comprehensive school. This met with very strong opposition from most of the teachers. Session 1969-70 saw much discussion of the comprehensive principle. I prepared discussion papers such as 'Notes on the Comprehensive School'. The integration resulted in the transfer of several senior teachers. There were two Principal Teachers of English. The one from ----- was transferred. There was a teacher-in-charge for ----- . He also was transferred. The teachers from both ----- and ----- were receiving extra payment for teaching junior secondary II classes. This extra payment disappeared when the classes became mixed-ability. One principal teacher came to my office after teaching her first mixed-ability class and said, 'I am a graduate of Oxford University. You surely do not expect me to teach this rubbish.' There were problems.

6. I did have the strong support of Her Majesty's Inspectors, advisers, Education Committee and Educational Officials. It was

the Education Committee which gave me the remit of integrating the four groups in Govan High School. The Director of Education called on my third day at ----- and was most upset when I told him that the school was still running as four schools owing to the fact that the timetables made up by the previous headmaster could not be altered immediately. The previous headmaster had been in charge of the school until 26 August and I had taken over on 27 August. He had not been willing to consult about the organisation of the school. In any case, I realised that it would take a year of discussion to enable teachers to accept an integrated school.

7. I have indicated above the main obstacles to comprehensive education and how I tried to overcome them. There were quite a few headmasters who were strongly opposed to comprehensive education, and their opposition was increased by extremists who wanted mixed-ability classes to continue throughout the school without any kind of setting. Although this extreme opinion seems now to have become accepted policy, I still take the view that it is not in the best interests of any of the pupils, and it makes the work of the teacher much more difficult.
8. In both my schools ----- and ----- there were teachers who supported the comprehensive idea enthusiastically. The Woman Adviser in ----- school went with me to ----- and she helped considerably to put over the idea.
9. In implementing the comprehensive system I was not limited in any way.

10. The public and parents were split over the comprehensive policy - all most on political lines. The parents of senior secondary pupils were afraid that the education of their children would suffer. The parents of junior secondary pupils were mainly apathetic but some were pleased that their children were going to ----- High School.
11. Circular 600 did cause teachers to consider the organisation of their schools, and in my case caused me to alter the structure of ----- School.
12. Both ----- School and ----- School were area schools. This created no real problems but I found on several occasions that pupils who removed to other areas of the city wanted to continue to attend ----- School. In ----- a problem was that some Roman Catholic parents wanted their children to attend ----- School.
13. The various papers herewith indicate the influence of Circular 600, 614 and Curriculum Paper 2 on the internal changes in ---- and ----- High School.
14. In the 1960s, I cannot recall the Teachers' Centre and in-service training playing a significant part. In the 1970s various groups and committees were set up to work out organisation of comprehensive schools. The Building Study Group 1971 and the Advisory Committee on the Organisation of Courses and Timetabling Reports herewith are examples.
15. The fee-paying schools continued to present a very big problem in

Glasgow. In December of each year a list of primary pupils to be transferred to secondary the following June was sent to ---- High School. The list recorded IQs and attainment marks. A final list was submitted the following May and it was heartbreaking to see that the majority of those pupils with high IQ and attainment marks were going to the Glasgow High School (Boys or Girls), Hillhead, Allan Glen's and a few to the private schools. At the end of the day these schools boasted about the number of passes in the Scottish Certificate of Education exams. This was completely unfair. ---- lost about 20 excellent pupils per year in this way, i.e. 100 over the five years. The addition of the 100 able pupils and their parents would have added increasingly to the standing and tone of the school.

19. Comprehensive education did change attitudes to curriculum and methods. There was more effort to give every child a second chance of succeeding in the early years of the secondary school. In my subject, Mathematics, the syllabus was drastically revised in 1964 with the old Euclidean Geometry being excluded, and new topics being introduced. In languages there was greater emphasis on the spoken word. Language labs were introduced. In Science new syllabuses were introduced and new methods were devised which minimised demonstration and maximised participation by the pupils in experiments.
20. Teachers had to change ideas and methods to fit in with the comprehensive system. Many were unable to do so and retired early.

21. The Scottish idea of encouraging the 'lad o' pairts' did cause some people to fear comprehensive education but, in fact, John Knox's system whereby all children went to the parish school was in line with the comprehensive idea. In my view, the gradual movement of pupils to courses suited to their aptitudes and abilities took care of the 'lad o' pairts', while providing a good education for the non-academic.

22. a) I find 'equality of opportunity' difficult to achieve. In schools we can make sure that every pupils has the chance to learn but, in my experience, the influence of home background often denies equality of opportunity. I recall Alex, a boy with very high IQ, who achieved little in school. His father was in and out of prison. Alex applied his intelligence to thieving and ultimately landed in a List D school.

b) In my experience the Labour Party supported the comprehensive school because it gave more working class children the opportunity to proceed to higher education.

PREAMBLE

Our main problem in ----- was welding 3 previous junior secondary schools into one unit made up of different pupils and different staff. We had the enormous advantage of having 'carte blanche', of starting afresh. The role of guidance was important as a unifying element in the school. What we did was take out the top 20% and the bottom 20% of pupils. The middle band of 60% formed the basis of our attempts at comprehensive education. We put them all together and sorted them out on an arithmetical basis. They got a general education, and those who came top got the chance of going on after the others left at 15.

1. Comprehensive education came about through political agitation,
+
2. but there was an educational foundation to it. The senior secondary/junior secondary caused considerable unhappiness in the same families, with siblings going to different schools. There was an upsurge of feeling among respected educationists that the old divisions were outdated and unfair.
3. I cannot comment about the 1947 Report's influence. I certainly don't recall it causing a big stir. The Macaulay Report in 1973 was the first report that moved us away from a system that had been static for decades.
4. The general feelings in society in the mid 60s were conducive to the creation of comprehensive schools. The election of the Labour Party in 1964 gave matters a helping hand, a push along, and furthered socialist ideas.

5. The main problem was the tremendous upheaval comprehensive education caused in all schools, but especially the older senior secondary schools which operated in a long-established rut. Some people just did not want to know about the new ideas. They saw comprehensive education as foisting lesser mortals on them against their will. They just refused to consider that the new system might have benefits or to alter their ways. The old system was an outstanding success in their eyes, and they derived a lot of job satisfaction from it. Those in junior secondary schools looked more favourably on the change, as their schools were being upgraded in the process. The creation of the Ordinary grade, and the significant number of junior secondary pupils who were successfully presented in the new exam was a powerful factor in making the comprehensive school inevitable.
6. a) I cannot recall Her Majesty's Inspectors taking any initiatives in respect of comprehensive education.
- b) Labour councillors were in favour of the comprehensive school, and argued for the benefits they saw it as creating. Saying that, however, there was no loud beating of drums.
- c) Heads had a totally free hand. the Directorate hardly ever came into discussions. Heads were left to their own devices, to work out their own internal solutions to the implications of comprehensive education. The parameters were very broad. The Directorate never issued edicts or fiats.
- d) Advisers were mostly regarded as a joke. In fact, they were a mixed bunch. Some had a high profile and took seriously their

main job - curriculum development and the planned re-education of teachers. Others were Aunt Sally figures, never seen, and getting regular brickbats. I would say that the Directorate created them in order to farm out some of their work at a period of substantial and regular change in education. Many of them drowned in the administration side of their work.

- e) The Consultative Committee on the Curriculum provided a reasonable stimulus for change - to a certain extent only. It pointed the way for those who wanted to take up its suggestions.
- 7. The major difficulty was one of attitude. Also, some schools, depending on their location, were really up against it, with all the odds stacked against them, since they did not have a large enough cross section of the social or academic population. They had very much to tailor what was on offer to suit the pupil types they had.
- 9. Headteachers had total autonomy within their own schools.
- 10. Parents who had 'high flyer' children felt they would lose out under the comprehensive system, which they saw as detracting from the former system. But in general, there was a tacit acceptance of the change.
- 11. The small number of private schools were no particular loss to the state system. Facilities were much better in local schools anyway, whereas some private schools were Dickensian in appearance. People sent children to these schools predominantly

for social reasons.

12. Answers to all of these can be simply summed up: the extent of
+
15. internal change, the amount of pupil integration and how children
+
16. were grouped depended entirely on the headmaster and his
educational philosophy. That was the most crucial factor. Much
of the curriculum and timetable arrangements remained on an
academic foundation for years. One of the greatest benefits was
guidance. It proved an important mechanism for welding the
school together - a force for the good in secondary education,
which took on a much more caring face.
13. In-service training certainly was ultra-available, but release to
attend was at the discretion of the headteacher. Reports on the
courses were variable. It is very difficult to estimate its
impact.
17. The arrival of the comprehensive school involved a considerable
change to both curriculum and teaching methods. Content in most
subjects underwent change. Gradually the notion of different
levels of ability was accepted, and this put paid to solid
classroom teaching, doing your party piece before the whole
class. But Scottish Certificate of Education exams had an
inhibiting effect on change. All the changes that occurred did
not have a detrimental effect on the quantity and quality of my
Scottish Certificate of Education passes in ----- in the years I
was there.
18. The extent to which teachers scrutinised their approaches to

their work was variable, so dependent on where you taught and your own enthusiasm. Teachers abhor change for change's sake, but if there is a point to it, that is different. I think that now we have a much more thinking profession. The rut mentality has gone. People are used to being challenged. This has been a desirable side effect of the changeover.

19. The comprehensive school was long overdue and more than welcome when it arrived. The old junior secondary/senior secondary gulf had to go. So it was a radical change to that extent. It was an inevitable product of post-war enthusiasm.
20. Equality of opportunity meant having as full an education as you were capable of achieving, with no delusions that we are all equal. It meant creating courses suited to individual needs and providing an escape hatch that was not there before for kids who did well.
22. The potential has not been tapped because
 - inadequate staffing
 - inadequate resources. Politicians wanted changes but would not or could not finance it properly. Education has always been at the cow's tail, and was allowed to tick over.

PREAMBLE

When I became a headteacher, education was a different world. things were much less technically professional - both at Directorate and school level. Things did not have the tight structure they do today. In-service was virtually unheard of. You could go from principal teacher to headteacher directly as I did. I don't think I could face a headteacher interview panel today. I subscribe to the ideas of the 1947 Report - education for the individual, and try to achieve that. I have been called the ultimate pragmatist, and I run the school by the seat of my pants.

In the late 60s the set up in ---- was that ----- High School had pupils in secondary 1/2 only and was run as a highly elitist establishment; ---- High School had secondary 3-6 and we had the job of integrating pupils from ---- who saw our place as an old dump. We had terrible vandalism and a lot of early leaving. It was a tough assignment trying to inspire standards of loyalty and decent behaviour in pupils. Then, a very active parent's campaign started to upgrade ---, so that there eventually were 3 all-through schools in ---. When they drew out the catchment aresa, we got a very raw deal, with four areas of priority treatment. In ----, 80% of pupils stay on to secondary 5 and 20% leave; in --- the proportions are exactly reversed. The ultimate plan, despite all our efforts and those of our Parents/Teachers Association, was imposed and did not do us much good. We are now the most 'difficult' school in ---- in terms of pupil intake.

1. I first became aware of discussions about comprehensive schools

in the 1960s when I was working at ----- Grammar School. A lot of schools in Lanarkshire towns were then multilateral. I had no deeply-held views, as I have never had any enthusiasm for the organisational aspects of education. Education is about relationships among individuals.

2. More weight came from the political than the educational side in my recollection. A lot depended, in amalgamation arrangements, on the quality of the junior secondary or four year school and on relations between it and the senior secondary. Sometimes these were good, more often they were poles apart, living in different worlds.
3. The 1947 Report created an atmosphere in which change could occur. It enjoyed great status. It was an educational milestone, very well written, but not categorical. It left the usual escape clause for local conditions. I would say that it very gradually shaped ideas over a long period of time. It takes time for ideas to have influence in education.
4. The most compelling reason why comprehensive schools became attractive in the 1960s is that the political and social climate was receptive to the concept. Labour was in power, and it was their policy, and had been for a while.
5. The main problem without a doubt was staff, a lot of whom had
+
7. been brought up in the senior secondary world. They had to come to terms and learn how to cope with many strange new creatures of whom they had had no knowledge and experience. The pressing

questions were: what will we teach? how will we teach it? They were totally unaware of the real span of pupil ability: the least able child, as far as they were concerned, was one who got neither French nor Latin. To start with, Circular 600 made no noticeable impression on schools, and brought no organisational/structural changes. As far as we were concerned, we were an omnibus school with two unselected classes. All efforts were turned to ensuring that pupils with talent did not suffer. Those who took it seriously tried to work out how to adapt existing syllabuses to accommodate the new intakes.

6. d) I can only comment about advisers. They had a very difficult job coping with an avalanche of change. They played a small but to some extent helpful part in developments. They were used as instruments of change, instigators or spreaders of new ideas, when a lot of teachers were crying out for stability and co-ordination.
9. Headteachers were not put under any pressure as far as I am aware. Some had moved very little even by the 1980s! The Strathclyde Regional Council secondary 1/2 Report brought internal organisation out into the open for the first time. It reminded those heads who were clinging to elitist ideals of the existence of comprehensive philosophy. But even it could only be described as exerting mild pressure.
10. For a lot of ----- people this is still 'the high school'. Those who did object objected at the way changes were made, at the lack of consultation. My approach to change was evolutionary

rather than revolutionary, so that in a way meant reaction was muted. Anyway, we do not have a large number of concerned parents. I suspect that many are not even aware of the changes that have occurred.

- 12.-
16.
- The extent to which changes happened inside schools depended entirely on the extent to which the headteacher wanted things to change. Change in education is almost wholly dependent on having the 'right' people in the right place at the right time. Clearly, headteachers and principal teachers held all the trump cards in this case. Organisational changes are easier to make than changes of approach and attitude. You can't change teachers' convictions, or make them enthusiastic. One of the most difficult problems has been to make senior staff, including principal teachers accept their role in personnel management. This has undoubtedly contributed to the extent and pace of change.
- 18.
- The only answer to this is an emphatic YES. Methods and the curriculum have had to change, whether we liked it or not. The geography of classrooms has altered, and in many subjects you can actually see the changes that have taken place when you enter classrooms - science, modern languages, music. But those who have had to work in old buildings with prefabricated huts past their life expectancy have had huge, but not insurmountable, problems to contend with.
- 19.
- A comprehensive school makes sense when it is a focal point in the community in a small town. In the urban setting it is

totally different. Catchment areas and social groupings create artificial barriers which break up communities. It is ludicrous that we are the 'local' school for ----- and ----- which are communities in their own right.

**PAGE
NUMBERING
AS ORIGINAL**

1. The main source of comprehensive initiatives in Lanarkshire was the Education Committee and the Director of Education even though he was not personally in favour of the comprehensive school and wanted to retain the county selective schools. He wriggled and evaded the issue for as many years as he could until the Chairman instructed him that he had no choice. He asked headteachers for their suggestions as to how best to organise comprehensive schools in their areas, and then he wrote documents on the subject for the Education Committee. Their policy was doggedly for all-through, six year comprehensive schools.
3. The first comprehensive intake at ----- was in 1970. The move to introduce comprehensive schools was brought about by politicians for social and educational reasons to end the divisiveness of the junior secondary/senior secondary system, which caused members of the same family to go to different schools. Labour Party policy was drawn from a social philosophy which was anti-elitist in everything. There were to be no sheep and goats even though both still existed. The politicians involved were not generally imbued with a knowledge of the practicalities of the educational system. A lot of the push came from England, and there was virtually no pressure for change coming from Scottish teachers.
5. The Scottish Education Department introduced the guidance structure and the Green Paper to make the political decision taken in Circular 600/614 work out in practice. These two

documents are essentially about problems of control that were surfacing in comprehensive schools as their rolls rose. There were also physical problems of accommodation - split-sites, annexes, and hutted buildings. Internally the main problem was having to rethink an over-academic curriculum and teaching style. Content had to be scaled down and the mode of presentation modified. Mixed-ability was an innovation imposed upon schools where an academic bias was prominent. Cognisance had to be taken of guidance, and attempts made at primary-secondary liaison. The aim was common treatment.

6. a) Her Majesty's Inspectors picked other people's brains and scouted around looking for 'good practice'. They incorporated 'good' ideas in documents they published, and got 'good' teachers to serve on working parties. Some of them, given their background, were as much at loss as people in schools.
 - c) Directorate staff were neutral as far as educational matters were concerned. They gave no input of ideas, but were preoccupied with staffing, resources and other day to day routine administration matters.
 - d) In my time advisers in Lanarkshire made no great contribution to developments.
8. Parents accepted the change passively, for the most part. But once the ethos of established schools with good academic reputations began to change, there was regret and disappointment. The old days began to be recalled as a golden age of excellence in all things, both curricular and extra-curricular. I have no

doubt that the level of pupil involvement in schools declined dramatically with the change to a comprehensive system.

9. Selective education was never a real problem in Lanarkshire. Elmwood and Hamilton Academy were the only two contentious places.
10. As a result of natural geography and unfortunate zoning policies, some schools were at a dreadful disadvantage with deprived and underprivileged pupils, social problems and hardly any able academic pupils. I think many Catholic parents regretted the change, but in a very philosophical, passive way. The link with the Church, preserved through the priesthood, was very powerful in keeping communities together and helping with problems in school.
11. In newer schools, there were not the problems of physical resources that plagued the older outdated buildings. The main problem was that of converting staff attitudes, getting them to adapt their materials and approach to suit the new intake. Pupils with learning difficulties presented an unprecedented headache. Some pupils were of such ability that teachers should have adapted their manners of speech accordingly. A lot of these pupils were initially segregated both physically and socially from the other pupils, but gradually it was realised that this was an educationally and personally disadvantageous practice. Some teachers were simply unwilling to change due to a lack of appreciation of the nature of the new problems; others were willing to change but unable. It was a traumatic time for many.

Only a minority, usually younger and keener, really got down to the main issues. Also, there were unheard of squabbles over money, with departments fighting with each other for a lion's share for their corner to restock book cupboards etc.

12. The practices within comprehensive schools were many and varied.
- + 13. I personally employed alphabetically-determined mixed-ability
- + 14. group for 2 whole years. I took the view that, as a servant of the Directorate, I had to accept if not agree with the official policy, and attempt to do my best to make it work. Not all headteachers were as firm as that with staff. For them, things stayed very much as they had been, so any 'change' was in name only. The spirit of the comprehensive movement was militated against by internal organisation and practices in many schools. Certain departments like Maths and French proved very resistant to change. A very predominant view was that whatever you did in a classroom the cream would always rise to the top. The change was imposed and generally unwelcome to teachers, and what actually happened in its name depended on the strength of the lead from heads and principal teachers.

15. a) Academic subjects in the curriculum, especially Classics and Modern Languages, diminished in value and/or lost their place. New subjects have been added, others split into constituent branches. The time had come to challenge the old cherished liberal education which had held sway for centuries. the tough industrial and economic realities of the world began to encroach on the world of education. As a result, aspects of education that had been revered for many years bit the dust.

- b) There was a plethora of worksheets and book-based work declined. Discussion in class and visual presentation increased. Emphasis was given to the eye and tongue as well as the ear. Chalk-and-talk was under attack. The atmosphere in classrooms was freer and more human. Even desks were moved out of the traditional serried ranks.
16. In-service training affected younger staff in the main. They were more open to change, eager to attend courses and implement fresh ideas in their classrooms. There also were teachers who jumped on the in-service band-wagon because it appeared to enhance their chances in the promotion stakes.
17. Scotland had many omnibus schools in places like Golspie, the Borders, Ayrshire etc. So the idea of getting all pupils together into one building was not new. But in these schools the academic pupil was the top dog. They made the school's reputation and kept alive the tradition of the lad o' pairts. There was before the war and for the decade or so after it a very strong emphasis in Scotland on the academic side of education leading naturally to University. Schools were run by Honours Graduates who had been conditioned to a certain view of education by their own education and training. The result was that the comprehensive school and all the educational talk of internal changes in its name was seen as posing a threat to academic excellence, the acme of the Scottish educational system. The results have justified these fears: academic dilution, disappearance of the range of extra curricular activities in schools, and the siphoning of staff attention to the undue

proportion of unintelligent/disadvantaged children and their social problems.

19. A comprehensive school.

- 1) takes all the pupils from a defined area
- 2) gives as equal an opportunity for academic and personal advancement as pupil background will allow
- 3) provides a large enough variety of courses to suit the varying activities and interests of its pupils
- 4) adopts a caring attitude to the specific problems of children who are emotionally/socially/educationally neglected.

20. The unquestionably not. The level of attainment of academic pupils has dropped. I doubt if the extent of the change has been as great as was promised, or if many pupils benefit from a comprehensive education. In a deprived area, a comprehensive school must be a demoralising place. There are, just as in racing, fast, slow and middle teams. An element of competition is part and parcel of the human condition. Competition and co-operation are not mutually exclusive. There are intrinsic tensions in a comprehensive school that teachers by their training and outlook are unable to solve.

POSTSCRIPT

Selective academic education was seen as a means of creating a Catholic professional class. This was partly because the first generation population was largely poorly educated and exclusively manual in occupation, and partly because Catholics were discriminated against in the West of Scotland in terms of employment opportunities.

1. I think there was an educational initiative of limited scope, because most people in Scotland had experienced an educational system based on a strict dichotomy - senior secondary/junior secondary schools. Each operated in isolation totally unaware of the other. Those with a wider experience began to see this split as unfair. This kind of thinking is native to Scottish education; comprehensive ideas were easier to adopt in Scotland. There have always been influential educators in Scotland. Also, however, there was a political initiative, both national and local. Councillors in Lanarkshire constituted a real powerblock. The work and thinking on comprehensive education was done for rather by them but they pushed it at meetings. They were keen on change for their constituents.
2. There was a fusion of educational and political moves, but undoubtedly the political will was there to see it introduced. There was some push from poorer junior secondary schools. Some people felt that the system was good and fair, especially when junior secondary schools were well run, but staffing and resources tended to be allocated to the senior secondary first.
3. The 1947 Report set people thinking. It was used as college reading by a whole generation of teachers. Change in education takes a long time. There were powerful voices in senior secondary teaching from the East of Scotland which were against change. There is definitely an East-West split in Scottish education, the former has no knowledge or conception of the

latter. The main purpose of education in the East has always been the promotion of pupils with academic ability and success in Scottish Certificate of Education exams. Both parts of the country have different perceptions of the truth.

4. In the 1960s people were encouraged to stay at school. There was a positive line on educational opportunities for all, which generated feelings about what we ought to be doing, and pointed to the shortcomings in the existing system. The introduction of the Ordinary grade, Brunton courses and the prospect of raising of the school leaving age all emphasised the educational arguments for going comprehensive.
5. The implications for schools of Circular 600 were greater than were imagined. Attitudes in education were entrenched and thirled to the sorting out and labelling of kids. This explains phrases like 'these comprehensive children'. The changes that took place in the wake of Circular 600 were in my opinion well short of the changes that were necessary to give the system a proper chance. Fundamental changes were required, and it is well proved that people in education are resistant to change.
6. a) Her Majesty's Inspectors contributed to the general theoretical backdrop. They were carriers of the fiery cross. They went round advocating the new comprehensive message.
 - e) Consultative Committee on the Curriculum papers were helpful to those who read them.
 - b) Local politicians were powerful in pushing a changeover, but I am

not sure if they fully understood the changes they so passionately advocated.

c) Directorate staff took comprehensive education on board - they had to. Predominantly there had to be an administrative dimension to their work, but in Lanarkshire the educational dimension was seen in the design and ethos of the new purpose-built schools that opened in the early 1970s, with their houseblocks.

d) The advisory input came much later on. In Lanarkshire there were County Committees chaired by (carefully selected) headteachers for most subjects. The advisers were the focus of change, and had the job of prioritising subject developments, and organising in-service courses.

e) The Consultative Committee on the Curriculum was influential, but it operated with certain tacit assumptions about the audience it played to, and the school world for which it was working. Some of its curriculum papers were not as good or influential as others.

7. The most powerful obstacle was unquestionably that of conservative attitudes. People in the senior secondary sector were not in favour of the comprehensive philosophy of education, and certain subject areas in particular demonstrated a lack of acceptance of its implications. The prevailing belief was that it was fair enough to have all abilities in one school, but that the internal organisation should be such that all abilities could be catered for separately.

9. Headteachers were given a certain amount of latitude as long as they did not express public or vocal opposition to the new system. There was no 'you must do this' on the part of the Directorate. As long as you did your best to head in a comprehensive direction, you were left to get on with it. This explains the variety of internal organisational patterns which grew up.
10. Parental reaction varied. A section was critical, because they thought comprehensive education would lower standards and harm their children. You heard people say 'the high school is just not the same now'. Many senior secondary schools were loved and respected locally, and had long reputations as successful schools. Less articulate and less well educated parents probably thought that the new system would give their kids a better chance.
11. Private schools cater for such a small percentage of pupils in the West of Scotland that they have no effect on the state system. People in area schools in housing estates just had to accept them and get on with it. Bussing pupils to achieve a better balance would never have been tolerated.
12. Both the extent and pace of internal change varied greatly from school to school. Many changes were achieved in nominal and organisational terms, e.g. mixed-ability classes, but I am not sure if we have even yet measured up fully to their full implications. Better commercially produced materials helped but they came much later. Guidance was also a great help internally.

13. In-service courses helped teachers to understand the changes better, but many found that their good intentions were frustrated back in school because of lack of resources, accommodation and resistant attitudes. Hence, my opinion that while the issues and needs of a comprehensive system were gradually better appreciated, the system as a whole never got a fair chance. Resources and staffing caused a mismatch between political expectations and educational reality.
14. a) On the whole headteachers accepted the principle of comprehensive education, but they put their own individual interpretation on it in their schools.
- b) Teachers were slow to change from the old senior secondary conception of education and teaching. Both the junior secondary and senior secondary sides were called upon to make adjustments to their professional practice, which left them threatened and exposed.
15. Curriculum design for a long time remained tiered as before - senior secondary streams, top junior secondary streams and the rest. Selection according to perceived ability, and the attitudes which accompanied it took a long time to die out. Recently increased political attention to what happens in schools has brought about more internal change.
17. a) The curriculum has changed markedly.
- b) Methods had to change of necessity. Teachers have been forced into the realisation that old ways did not work any more in the

comprehensive circumstances. Their awareness has increased, and many more are now prepared to ask what it is they are trying to do. The dominance of the Universities and the resultant striving for Ordinary and Higher passes has always had a big impact in schools, and caused a lot of wastage.

18. Teachers' approaches did change, but it took a while.
19. The concept of the comprehensive school - in the sense of pupils of all abilities in one school - was not new. The lad o' pairts tradition in which any pupil with ability could go on to University without let or hindrance has been with us for a while. That was how we interpreted equality of opportunity. What was new was the idea of opening up all subjects to access by pupils of all abilities.
20. There has always been a popular misconception that the Scottish system promoted quality. I, myself, query this. The system has never been resourced to an extent adequate to create true equality of opportunity.
21. A comprehensive school takes all pupils of whatever ability from its local area, and divides its resources evenly so that they all get a chance to produce the best work of which they are capable. All facets of the school should be open to all its pupils. I think, however, that over the period you are looking at the pendulum has swung too much the other way, with too much attention being paid to the less able group.

22. No, the potential of the comprehensive school has not been achieved. There has been a major change in the concept of education, and colossal changes both in education and society have taken place over the period. The changes have not been well enough phased and vastly under-resourced in human and financial terms. More recently, the educational policies of the Tory government look like sounding the death knell of comprehensive education.

1. I always felt that comprehensive education was dragged into Scotland on English coat-tails. Their system was unjust and causing a lot of public disquiet, whereas ours worked well and was much fairer. Political will fought for it and got it introduced. Without a Labour government there would never have been comprehensive schools - it's as simple as that.
2. In my view, the moves were entirely political, as there was no clamour among teachers for change. In Scotland quite the reverse! Politicians thought that the school could be an agent of social change and so promote greater justice.
3. The 1947 Report to my mind was confused in its thinking. It proposed something which was educationally and socially ideal, but which was at odds with the way people lived. I do not think it had much influence on educational thinking.
4. Quite simply because there was a wide disparity in educational provision in England, coupled with a realisation that schools were the best avenue of success for ordinary people's children. From 1945 onwards in Scotland, anyone who was judged capable was able to get a place in a senior secondary school. Provision was even too generous. The old Scottish senior secondary school did what it was supposed to do very well. The odd pupil got the chance to move up from the junior secondary. The major Achilles heel for the new idea was housing policies which had caused places like Easterhouse and Drumchapel to come into existence.

5. Whether you saw the introduction of comprehensive schools as a problem or not depended on where you were at the time. If you taught in a 'good' area it didn't matter a damn. If you were in a junior secondary or 4 year school that was going to be upgraded to comprehensive status there was even some enthusiasm for the idea. The places that took it worst were old established senior secondary schools, which were suddenly faced with an influx of pupils of a type the staff neither wanted nor were adept at dealing with.
6. a) Her Majesty's Inspectors are placemen who do what the civil servants tell them. They go round promoting whatever educational idea is flavour of the month. I decide how much credence to give them when I find out how long and where they taught, and what school they themselves attended.
- b) Politicians either tried to promote or thwart the comprehensive thing depending on what party they were in. Their views were not always on party lines. The Labour Party in particular was split, since some of their members saw that the new system might damage their own children or at least put them at risk.
- c) Able adept Directors had the power to play their Committee along in whatever way they wanted - more then than now. A few stalled and held things up. The Director in Lanarkshire was renowned for his anti-comprehensive stance.
- d) My perception is that advisers had no influence on educational policy whatever.

7. The main obstacle was the refusal of the politicians to consider the real implications of a change in educational philosophy. They caught hold of some nice-sounding slogans 'equality of opportunity' is a good example - without having a clue what they really implied for schools. The social arguments for the comprehensive school were not ignoble, the educational ones were pie in the sky - a waste of time. I think a comprehensive school should take all children irrespective of sex, religion, social status or colour from its local area. To that extent the comprehensive school has not failed - it has never been tried.
9. In the early days, rectors were god-like figures. They had total latitude. Nobody queried what they did. In fact, many of them continued to run senior secondary schools under a comprehensive label. Since Regionalisation, however, things have changed. Pressure on heads has intensified. The secondary 1/2 report was a major turning point. There is greater accountability. They are managers in a non-managerial situation.
10. Again, parental reaction depended on where you lived. the majority reaction to all things educational among parents is numbing apathy. Those whose children would have gone to a junior secondary school were pleased.
11. a) Area schools were very relevant in Scotland. They attempted to cater for all levels, but population migration to the new towns drained housing estates of good families, which tended to be replaced by poor calibre or problem tenants. To make area schools work, you would have had to resort to bussing people, and

no one saw that as acceptable, politically or educationally. Also, single sex and denominational schools were allowed to continue. The Labour Party never made its mind up on central issues in comprehensive education. The motives, educational and social, were always confused.

b) Private schools represent such a tiny number of pupils that they have no effect on the state system in the West of Scotland.

12. All in all, it didn't make the difference it should have. In general, the business side of the school was still arranged on academic lines, with pupils of differing abilities mixing in extra curricular activities. A senior secondary school is much easier to run than a comprehensive school. The main change was the introduction of guidance, in an attempt to make schools all things to all men. In the old days all the hard work put in by teachers had positive outcomes. Nowadays I'm not so sure. Comprehensive education assumes a versatility and willingness to adapt that most teachers do not have.

13. In-service training helped in as much as it made some teachers examine what they were doing in classrooms. Its chief value was that it introduced teachers to methods other than chalk-and-talk. Technology is certainly better. I am not sure of the net effect. One of teaching's eternal verities is that most teachers do not change, despite Her Majesty's Inspectors Reports and Consultative Committee on the Curriculum papers. I also think that there has been a dilution in the quality of entrants to teaching. They have a better and more open attitude to kids, but I'm not always sure about the rigour of their academic qualifications. Kids

like to be taught by good teachers, and can spot them - and the opposite - a mile away.

14. a) Again it depended. In omnibus schools, there were changes in terminology but that's all. Not much changed in the early days. If you were going to or your school was going to benefit from the introduction of comprehensive schools, then you were for it. If on the other hand your schools was going to change 'for the worse', you were against it.

b) Teachers were either against it or affected by enlightened self-interest. Many started waving flags enthusiastically, taking the view that if this is what the politicians wanted, they would get right in and give it a good bash.

15. Many people saw the junior secondary/senior secondary split as efficient and basically right. The ethos of separatism in Scottish schools has never really been overcome - in the day-to-day intercourse of school activities kids are separated on lines of ability. It's not malevolent. That's the way it is.

16. a) Mixed-ability was another flavour of the month, but most heads preferred some form of ability grouping, and most teachers hadn't the ability to teach any other way.

b) In secondary 3/4, the top sections appeared for the sake of Scottish Certificate of Education results. I do not think that the comprehensive school gets as many good results in Scottish Certificate of Education, because the rigour has gone out of teaching, and the expectations of the pupils by staff are not so

high as they were.

17. a) The comprehensive school accelerated the death of the classics and mortally wounded modern languages.

b) As one who clings to the elitist view, I think methods have changed. There is more noise and bustle. In my view, the class listens to the teacher. The teacher listens to the class on his terms.
18. The main things which caused teachers to rethink their approaches were mixed-ability, the common course and raising of the school leaving age, not comprehensive schools.
19. It fitted very well in places like Forfar and Brechin, and all places that had district, all-ability schools. In huge cities where you had senior secondary/junior secondary schools it did not fit at all well. De facto, in 1986, you have all-through comprehensive schools or four-year schools with a small secondary 5/secondary 6 tagged on. Demographical decline and the Parents' Charter have signalled the death of the comprehensive school.
20. There has always been equality of opportunity in Scotland. The system was seen as fair. Everybody who got to senior secondary got a chance.
21. We have never had comprehensive schools in a social sense in this part of the world. People do not live comprehensively nor do they wish to. A change in educational philosophy or the adoption

of a new policy will not change that basic fact.

22. What is the evidence of the success of the comprehensive school? There has not been a dramatic increase in the numbers of working-class kids going to University. We have not got the curriculum or assessment right yet. Truancy and disaffection are still very much part of the school scene. Pupils have effectively deschooled themselves. Outside factors have obviously had their effect - falling rolls, the economy, changes of government, economic policy etc. The best days of the comprehensive school are probably over. I still think you can achieve more social change by vigorous teaching of a high quality, with concern for pupils' progress, than you can by trying to be an amateur social worker doing an odd spot of teaching. Remember that in speaking to people in the education service, you are meeting the successes of the system, who live in nice areas. People operating a system do not readily admit to its failings, of which they are part.

1. There was just no movement at all prior to Circular 600 in Lanarkshire because of the very strong opposition to the introduction of comprehensive schools by the Director. Those teachers who were political - either in the Educational Institute of Scotland or the Labour Party - tried to use what influence they had to 'spread the word', but there was strong opposition, especially among the headmasters of senior secondary schools.
2. I would say it was due to a mixture of social ideas of the period, and the effect these were having on some influential people in education. The push came from England, where there was growing dissatisfaction with the elitist grammar schools. In Scotland, we weren't as badly in need of comprehensive schools as England was because we had a long tradition of one school serving one area. Our problem was in the urban areas of high population, where you had the junior/senior secondary hierarchical arrangement. Even in senior secondaries you had a division. We all thought we were clever enough to select children on their performance in a test but there were many faults in the system. In Lanarkshire, of course, we had Hamilton Academy, which robbed other schools of their ablest children, and had a bad effect in my opinion. It was widely believed that, for example, the best teachers were sent to Hamilton Academy, with other schools getting 'the rest'.
3. Not at all. The main body to give vocal support to the idea of the comprehensive school in Scotland was the Educational

4. People were becoming disgruntled with selection at primary 7/secondary 1 stage, and with the imbalanced allocation of staff to schools. The staffing allocation in Lanarkshire was very poor - I mean the way it was done. The administration just did not seem capable of bringing in a system in which all schools got a fair share of all the available staff. What were regarded as 'top' schools (the big senior secondaries) were intentionally kept better staffed than others in the County.
6. 1) Not in a move like this. They could have organised training for senior staff, but they did not. People were just left to get on with it.
- 2) Some definitely did have an influence, but they were usually the ones who had been influenced by politically-minded teachers. You do not normally find much original thinking about education among councillors.
- 3) Lanarkshire was dreadfully behind other areas in getting advisers, presumably because the Director didn't believe in them. He had peculiar ideas which took hold of his mind (e.g. on guidance) and to which he gave great importance, but other things were not looked at.
- 4) They did not give much direction. They were very remote from the schools, and did not know either about the staff or what was going on in them.
- 6) It had some influence through its publications. In my opinion,

not enough ordinary teachers were represented on it, and most senior men in schools were just not interested in curriculum development. You see, the move to comprehensive schools was equated by them as heralding a lowering of the status of their long-established senior secondary schools with their excellent traditions. We have always been good at educating the bright kids in Scotland, by and large, we have failed miserably with the rest.

7. The attitudes of staff in general, especially senior promoted ones, who did not embrace the new ideas enthusiastically. Lack of preparation of schools for the change, by for example the Directorate staff. There was not enough ground work done. In fact, I often think that the tremendous growth in numbers of Roman Catholic children after the war, which resulted in many new purpose-built schools - gave a great boost to comprehensive schools in Lanarkshire.
8. Despite what I have said, the Director of Education, once he got going, he produced some good documents and set up working parties. He had a good brain - and was a thinker and read a lot, even though he was ideologically opposed to the whole idea.
9. I could do whatever I liked. I had total freedom. This was all very well if you had sectors who were committed to change. I often came away from headteachers meetings thinking that comprehensive education would never properly get off the ground until the vast majority of them retired. It was the same with the Headteachers' Association of Scotland. It was completely

non-political, and consequently had no influence whatever. You will never get anything done in education unless you are political. The Headteachers' Association of Scotland was a pleasant gentlemen's club which met on occasions for discussions, lectures on topics of the day and pleasant social exchanges. In general, it was predominantly selective-minded, dominated by a few men, usually from selective or fee-paying schools, and consequently opposed to comprehensive education.

12. Not a great deal, as far as I know. But it was very prevalent for most common schools serving one area to be in reality two schools under the one roof. ----- was like that when I took over. You had a split in attitude among staff. 90% of all money spent from per capita allowances went to the bright kids. Non-certificate children often didn't even have proper books. Also, heads of department rarely took their share of the not-so-bright pupils. There was in addition a hierarchy of subjects - academic and practical/aesthetic, with a consequent devaluation of teachers of the latter, which showed itself in their inferior salaries and non-existent promotion prospects.

13. In the mid sixties - seventies, most schools still had divided populations within them. The philosophy of the rector is always crucial, and given what I have said about their views, I would say that comprehensive schools have not been successful for the majority of their pupils. I sometimes think that the quality of work, work rate and finished product of our best junior secondary schools were much higher than in most comprehensive schools.

14. In-service training had an effect, especially the panels for subjects and their printed outputs, but there was always minority staff involvement in them because it was voluntary, and thus depended on individuals' levels of interest.
15. Hamilton Academy and Elmwood Roman Catholic Convent Schools were magnets - both for pupils and staff, who thought they were the cat's pyjamas if they got a teaching post there. There is no doubt that they robbed schools of their ablest pupils.
16. As a group, headteachers were totally opposed to comprehensive education in Lanarkshire. I can recall only three or four being keen on getting it going.
17. It changed it, ending some dreadful junior secondary schools. I thought it was a step in the right direction, especially for the less able pupil. You must always ask yourself if you are doing your best by them. It is not a question that is seriously addressed by a great many in senior posts.
18. I'm against the idea that mixed-ability classes should continue into secondary 3. In fact, probably about a year and a half is about right. But all pupils must thereafter have provided for them a curriculum for the highest quality and be taught well. They must all be integrated into the social fabric of the school - clubs, sport, etc. It should be deliberate policy for all staff to have a share of all abilities of pupils.
19. a) There was little difference in the curriculum.

- b) Possibly some changes in junior classes, but not much in senior.
20. I think that is beginning to happen now in the 1980s, but it definitely did not at the early years, when it was very much business as usual. There was insufficient contact between the Director, his staff and the people doing the job in the schools.
21. It was a shock for many in the profession, by virtue of their own education, training, outlook and experience. Those people who were 'thinkers' thought it was a step in the right direction. Most of the others thought it the reverse, and were opposed to it to a greater or lesser extent. And what made matters worse was that opponents had the Director's support. Maybe they just kept hoping it wouldn't happen.
22. a) It depended on the political outlook. I would say it meant that every child should have an equal opportunity to show what he can do, to achieve his full potential - whatever that is - without having doors closed or ceilings imposed prematurely.
- b) To some extent yes, but of course what a comprehensive school can achieve for all its pupils is closely linked to its curriculum provision, teaching methods, pupil guidance and general atmosphere. It's back to the headteacher, his philosophy, his influence.
23. A school serving one area which takes in the full range of ability initially, and, after an agreed period of time, provides different levels of curriculum in each subject and makes sure

that all staff get a fair share of all pupils. You must guard against promoted posts creating a caste system among the staff. Also it must have a strong social side.

24. It is only now beginning to be tapped. There has been much more Scottish Certificate of Education exam success, which is an important, but not the only, criterion. The persistence of elitism has not been fundamentally shaken by the creation of comprehensive schools. What is still required is far more in-service training with the emphasis on the philosophy underlying comprehensive education and, above all, sympathetic and energetic headteachers.

1. I would say that the major source of comprehensive policy initiatives was England. We heard with horror about the London comprehensives of around 2,000 pupils. Basically, there was a growing public outcry at the small percentage of primary pupils who made it to grammar schools, the providers of a good education and opportunities in later life. My first recollection of the word 'comprehensive' in Scotland was the early 60s.
2. The moves I think were basically educational, but denial of opportunity inevitably has political overtones. The arguments in the educational world (in England, not here) were therefore affected by political considerations. Educational ideas, if you like, were overshadowed by an egalitarian uprising in the political world.
3. It reinforced the place of the omnibus county or small burgh schools which have a long tradition and respected place in Scottish education. Pedley does not mention Scotland in his book because these Scottish schools existed already and were much the same as he was advocating for England. So, when the whole thing came up from England, it had a familiarity about it.
4. It was a combination of an escalation of egalitarian thinking in society, a desire for equality and fairness, and an impetus given to it by the election of the Labour Party. It would have happened anyway. Labour just accelerated the process.

5. Not very many differences to start with. I remember the Headteachers' Association of Scotland did a questionnaire survey of its members on the introduction of comprehensive schools. The result was that most heads favoured the type of school they were currently in charge of: SENIOR SECONDARIES. I certainly enjoyed the experience of ----- which took the top cut of local primary children together with the brightest of all primary schools in the County. At the time comprehensive schools were introduced, people thought in terms of different cut-off points for different groups of primary children. That was the accepted thing. In --- - those about point 1 came to use, above point 2 to ----- and the rest to the local junior secondary.
6. 1) Members of Her Majesty's Inspectors were suddenly converted to thinking along comprehensive lines.
- 2) Local politicians followed the party line.
- 4) Directorate staff were cautious, pushed gently by the thoughts of the time. The Director was reluctant to throw the existing system out of the window. He wanted to retain the best of what he had. He believed there was a place for a school like -----.
- 5) The Education Committee was left wing, so supported the comprehensive school, but they had little intelligent commitment to it.
7. There were no legal or practical obstacles. The main obstacle was prejudice and attitudes. When you consider the number of people who had strongly identified with the segregated system of education, comprehensives were seen as a revolutionary move which

interfered with sacrosanct practices.

8. The transition to a comprehensive system went in an extraordinarily smooth manner, but the side-effects associated with its arrival were not so smoothly accepted. There was no bitter or vocal opposition. Since the policy was externally imposed without consultation, it was a case of make the best of it as you saw it. It would be true to say that there were grave misgivings about the whole thing.
9. I was always left free to do as I wanted. There was no dictation, no laying down of the law, rather discussions and advice. The only issue I recall there being anything vaguely like pressure about was selection within the school.
10. Parental reaction was related to the ability of their children: the parents of previously excluded, junior secondary children hailed the comprehensive school as wonderful; those who had very able children feared that the school would be swamped by slow children. For them, the feelings were of lament, as they were for many senior secondary teachers.
11. Junior secondary schools had depressing reputations as dumps for the flotsam and jetsam of the primary schools. The main implication for many schools was having for the first time to deal with children who were not committed to education. Suddenly they had to teach pupils who couldn't care less about what was happening in class, in common with their parents.

12. Sceptics used the area school as an argument against the comprehensive school. In such schools, the proportion of able pupils could only be infinitesimal.
13. There was no significant change in the early years, but the whole question of class organisation and how to group children became a topic of discussion as it had never been before.
14. My recollection of Lanarkshire in the mid 60s was that training provision for teachers did not exist in any systematic form. There were occasional headteacher and principal teacher meetings, but not much more.
15. Fee-paying schools did not exist in Lanarkshire.
16. Some headteachers, a few only, were in favour of the comprehensive school, most of the others were doubtful, while no one to my recollection was out-and-out opposed. I think it would be right to say that, because it was imposed and new, many wanted to wait and see how the cat jumped, before committing themselves, to see how far the comprehensive idea would assert itself. Even the most enthusiastic heads came back somewhat chastened after a visit to English comprehensives in London, which were held up as models of excellence.
17. Streaming on academic and social grounds went on, there's no doubt of that, although perhaps the advent of the comprehensive school lent emphasis to the academic at the expense of the social criterion.

18. I think there should be mixed-ability classes for six months then setting by subject. I think that is preferable to the previous segregated system, which took firm decisions on linguistic ability only. Perhaps comprehensive education has encouraged teachers to take a broader view of ability - no bad thing!
19. 1) Yes, the comprehensive school probably upgraded subjects which were marginally significant, and thus made inroads into the reign of narrow academicism which was typical of senior secondary schools.
- 2) Yes, I think methods are always in a state of flux and development anyway, so I am sure that the comprehensive school helped it along. The problem that we all had to contend with was that curriculum and methods to a large degree were determined by the requirements of the Scottish Certificate of Education exam schedule.
20. I think that the comprehensive school did cause some teachers to think about what they were doing. They had to survive.
21. From John Knox through the parish school the comprehensive idea has been the accepted norm in Scotland.
22. a) I think it was seen as removing all irrelevant obstacles to any child going as far in education as his ability allowed, preferably to University. The lad o' pairts tradition was strong, especially in industrial areas like Lanarkshire. Many parents wanted their children to do well, so they would get a

good job which would not involve them in having to 'take their jackets off and dirty their hands'. Many parents wanted opportunities for their children which they themselves had not had for whatever reason.

b) Yes, I was very much aware of this view in the Labour Party. Ironically, many local councillors were really keen to destroy --- but have their own children educated there before it disappeared. They said that every child in ----- should have a chance to attend -----, which, paradoxically, would have destroyed the reason why they thought the school was so unique, viz its academic selectivity. A lot of councillors spouted the comprehensive gospel without having a clue about its real implications.

23. A comprehensive school is one which resembles the traditional local school for a small county town - where all the local children go and get an education matched to their ability. In industrial areas, the junior secondary/senior secondary split was a numerical expedient rather than an educational principle. It is traditional for Scottish pupils to go to the same school. In my view, the modern concept of the comprehensive school has brought in all sorts of artificial considerations - guidance, structure of promoted posts - which are really irrelevant, and are only organisational structures to combat size.

I do not think that, say, Oban High School or Dunoon Grammar School are in 1985 substantially different from what they always were, except perhaps that they now feel the moral urge to pay attention to academically weaker streams a bit more now that they

are comprehensive.

24. Definitely not.

1. The initiative came with the publication of Circular 600. My understanding is that the initiative was substantially political rather than educational. The Scottish movement was a reflection of the one in England. There are many parallels like this in educational initiatives. The comprehensive movement derives from broad social and political principles. There were, of course, several educational arguments going around at the time. For me the most convincing was the grey area or no man's land between the junior and senior secondary populations. The cut-off point was around IQ 104. But how could you accurately predict success? The predictors were doubtful to say the least. Although it was always said that transfer was possible later if ability was demonstrated, this remained theoretical rather than actual in most cases. Although some of us were beginning to think along these lines, there was no wide discussion of the desirability of a comprehensive system in educational circles prior to Circular 600.
2. The main push was political, but educational arguments were provided. There was no groundswell of educational opinion in favour of a change from the old junior secondary/senior secondary system.
3. I do not honestly know.
4. The social situation in Britain was ripe for it. There was increasing hostility to the divisiveness of the education system

based as it was on fairly rigid selection at an early age. The political ethos of the age was all for equality and social unity. There was the affluence and the 'you've never had it so good' mentality. So you had a social, political and economic climate which favoured the introduction of an educational system which would unify the population, and help to achieve desirable social objectives. In a sense there was a comprehensive approach on all fronts to establish a more equal society, and eliminate invidious distinctions between different social groups.

5. In Lanarkshire it led to a massive programme of new building. If the comprehensive system was to work, it had to have purpose-built schools and proper school structures. The purpose-built concept was based on offering appropriate courses to a wide range of pupils of differing abilities. Vocational/leisure facilities were incorporated, and lavish provision was made in Technical and Home Economic departments. The physical provision was expressly designed to maximise the chances of success for the comprehensive principle. Also incorporated were house blocks as part of the emphasis on pupil guidance - smaller units to avoid the factory syndrome. Much work was done on this, and many visits were made to schools in England to see it in operation. The teaching structures and class groups were as far as possible replicas of house affiliations. But where you had old buildings or split sites, as there were in Lanarkshire, you had problems. Brunton courses never really took off, as it proved difficult to break down the old structural models of education that teachers held dear. As a result, and to our shame, specialist facilities were not as fully utilised as they might have been, even in the

purpose-built units. Old habits die hard in the minds of many teachers.

6. 1) Her Majesty's Inspectors had a facilitating function for the new roles teachers would have to play in the new system. They were there to help practitioners understand how to implement comprehensive principles in the classroom, to draw their attention to examples of good practice. On occasion they would have to discuss with Directors and heads and badger the reluctant, but in a pleasant way. Their task is to be liaison agents between national policy and local implementation of it.
- 2) I don't really know as I had hardly any contact with them.
- 3) I'm not sure exactly what the contribution of advisers was. They were originally appointed in the practical subjects, but changes in the 60s caused an expansion of the advisory service into academic subjects. The contribution depended heavily on the kind of personality of the adviser, and what resistance he would meet from principal teachers.
- 4) Education officials went along with it, but tended to divide themselves into two groups - those who favoured the all-through comprehensive school, and those who wanted to preserve some elements of the old structure, especially at the top end of the school and favoured the two tier system.
- 5) The Education Committee was influenced by Directors acting as their professional guides.
- 6) The Consultative Committee on the Curriculum was created in order to provide a mechanism which had a chance of bringing about

curriculum development in schools. Its creation was not connected with comprehensive schools as such. The Government and the Scottish Education Department realised that previous Reports that had been issued were not having the desired influence on school practice. The activities of Consultative Committee on the Curriculum 1+2 were intended to clear away a number of subsidiary problems, e.g. Ruthven. Later in the 70s it became clear that the curriculum and assessment were not resolving themselves as had been anticipated. We had comprehensive schools but not a comprehensive curriculum. Comprehensive schools, raising of the school leaving age and other changes had created a curricular void, and a great deal of frustration. Hence the appointment of the Munn and Dunning Committees.

7. - Inadequate buildings.
- The innate conservatism of the teaching profession.
- The speed and number of innovations in 60s and 70s.

Although there was much discussion of the issues, it took a great deal of effort to get staffs to accept the full implications of making comprehensive policy workable in schools.

8. Her Majesty's Inspectors, Directorate and headteachers (and their staffs) all pulling together.
9. In Lanarkshire, the lines of development were very clearly laid down. I was a comprehensive-minded head, so I did not need to be forced. On the whole, heads had a fair degree of latitude in internal organisation, within constraints like the house system.

10. On the whole, I think it was welcomed, except for parents of extremely able children who feared they might not get as good a deal as in the old set-up.

11. The implications of Circular 600 were:

- Mixed-ability classes, and the common course
- Social organisation and guidance provision.
- What to do with non-certificate pupils in secondary 3/4.

Basically, the implication was this: how do you accord equality of treatment to all pupils? I think we failed in this basic task. In fact I'm sure we did. As long as pupils were heading for Ordinary and/or Highers they were looked after. Much less was done for those of lower ability. For them it was all improvised, there was no planning, teacher preparation or curricular provision. It all had to do with teachers' perceptions of what was valuable. Frankly, the less able pupils did not matter as much. The able were the number one priority. Attitudes were a subtle but powerful barrier to progress.

12. Not really.

13. Very slowly after provision was reorganised on comprehensive lines - it certainly did not happen overnight. Only eventually did people try to put comprehensive principles into practice. Obviously there were varying degrees of commitment and therefore varied success. An important factor was the large amount of discretion built in to Circular 600. Responsibility for its implementation was devolved down the line.

14. Both Teachers' Centres and in-service courses burgeoned at this time. Both were a helpful development. There was, for the first time, the establishment of a local structure for curriculum development as an adjunct to the national one. This was deliberate Scottish Education Department policy under Brunton. Panels for every subject were set up. I think they were very effective from 1967-75. Success, of course, depended on the Chairperson and the quality of the membership. Her Majesty's Inspectors played an important role in getting these set up. This local network enabled the ordinary teacher to make a contribution. These developed a core of committed teachers who did sterling work on developments in individual subjects. Nothing of a more general nature was attempted at the start.
15. None, except that Hamilton Academy and Elmwood had to go. Schools which took the 'creme de la creme' were an anomaly. Fee-paying and independent schools who claim they are comprehensive cannot, in fact, be given the skewed social background of their intake.
16. I do not remember any opposition. Comprehensive education just sort of happened. Many did their best, but you cannot escape the tendency in the Scottish system to value pupils of high academic ability and to be concerned that they do not suffer. This was never absent in the new comprehensive system, and was carried over from the selective system, especially in the early years.
17. Certainly, in secondary 1/2. As far as possible, these years should be arranged as one community, and even as far as possible

up the school thereafter. What happened was that some principal teachers came and substantiated a case for setting in secondary 2; national exams began to make their mark that early, and the distinction between certificate and non-certificate pupils because of the courses to which they were assigned became clearer in secondary 3/4. The multilateral school has proved a powerful model in Scottish eyes, so that in comprehensive schools traditional divisions tended to be kept and manifested themselves in separate streams. Because all the implications of Circular 600 were not appreciated, headmasters proceeded with discretion.

18. There should be mixed-ability classes in secondary 1/2, with setting across subjects thereafter. At all costs, pupils should not be labelled or rejected. Differing abilities must, of course, be catered for, but in a non-divisive way. Courses can be labelled; pupils should never be. Teacher attitude and approach are crucial. Some form of setting must be built in to protect the interests of the able, and there is no escaping the fact that headteachers must settle the best arrangement with individual departments. A process of negotiation must go on to settle on the most advantageous system for all pupils. There is no one answer, no magic formula.
19. In the longer term, a marked effect on both, but not in the short-term, because the implications of the changeover to comprehensive schools were not fully realised, e.g. there had to be a new emphasis on practical and vocational elements in the curriculum, and this ultimately led to notions of a balanced core curriculum. With methods too, change was long in coming, but the

advent of comprehensive schools has helped to extend the range of methods used for the benefit of all children. There has been a perceptible departure from didactic methods towards cultivating more relevant skills and a general shift of our understanding of how to arrange the teaching situation on a more individualised basis.

20. Again there was a snowball effect - not very much analysis went on in the early years, but I would say that the switch to comprehensive education has exerted a gradual but pervasive effect on all aspects of education.
21. It was much more in line with Scottish thinking than English. Because our country is geographically dispersed the natural means of educational provision has been the omnibus school, with its tradition of catering for the full range of ability in one building. Also, Scotland was much more generous in the percentage of pupils it admitted to senior secondary courses - a good ten per cent more pupils went than went to Grammar school in England. Nevertheless, the overriding concern has been to promote the interests of the bright child and ensure their path was smoothed to higher education for the good of the country.
22. a) Very much in the lad o' pairs concept, that is equality of opportunity was inbuilt into the system as long as you were able. It is doubtful if it was ever conceptualised as equality of opportunity for all children. Having said that, I feel there has been a widening of the concept in recent years to include a broader range of pupils, but a large shift in attitude and

approach is required to achieve this.

23. A comprehensive school is one which makes adequate educational provision for pupils of all types, irrespective of their academic ability within a uniform structure which takes account of different capacities and avoids consequential labelling of pupils. Such a school provides equality of treatment and opportunity in a caring and fair atmosphere. The key point is that all pupils must receive equal attention and their education be regarded as of equal importance.
24. No, but it is in a gradual process of being realised. As curriculum and assessment are redesigned to complement the organisational structure and heterogeneous pupil population, we are gradually moving in the right way. Standard Grade, if it continues, is a step in the right direction.

1. My impression, being active in education in 1960s, was that there was no talk of comprehensive schools whatever, either in schools or at meetings with the Director. It was just accepted that schools ran as they always had, it being left entirely up to the headteacher what he did. I was fortunate that I had worked under Dr T Wright, who was open to innovation and gave me many ideas. Even in the 1940s we ran what we called 'social studies' courses, which were not all that different from what is now Modern Studies. I was against divided schools, but believed in grouping according to ability, both to do justice to those who could gobble up certificate work - is it justifiable to retard them? - and to give a valuable educational diet to all pupils. And I was able to convince most of my staff at ----- that the education of all children mattered. This was by no means a widely-held view in many schools at this time. I must say that the Director backed me in all I did, and helped put my school on the educational map. There was a good positive spirit in the school, where hard work and a discipline for staff and pupils was the order of the day.
2. Undoubtedly political. It would never have happened if left to those in education. The political push created comprehensive schools, in which a minority of enlightened educationists had believed for many years, but had got nowhere in trying to promote them.
4. It was partly the widely recognised failure of selection

procedures at 11+, a hatred of the stigma attached to segregation after primary, and a widespread desire to see fairness established. This applied as much to staff as to pupils in the secondary sector.

5. Minimal. A lot of teachers looked - and look - down their nose at the less able. Most experienced and best qualified teachers took the bright examination 'certainties', leaving younger colleagues out of training colleges to get on with the rest. Selecting the able and exam passes were the main concern, despite all the dogma about opportunities and chances. Yes, schools were called comprehensive, but ten minutes in any staffroom would be enough to convince you that all it meant was that all kids came to one school, but internally there was rigid separation of pupils with little flexibility to allow them to mix. Apart from that, a lot of headmasters were glorified office boys who dealt with paper not pupils. They didn't know half of what was going on - no use to anyone, that!

6. 1) Much depended on Her Majesty's Inspectors. They weren't all interested in the same things. Many had little or no experience of what they were asked to supervise, but those who were more involved praised teachers doing good work, and broadcast the fact. They were helpful in that respect, which often got you more backing for ideas, but I wouldn't say they were influential in educational matters.
- 2) They toed the party line when they had to. No all them were pro-comprehensive you know, far from it. A lot sent their own kids to selective schools or fee-paying schools if they could afford

it. They had little knowledge of, or interest in, education.

- 3) The Director was a great man for getting ideas from good teachers and heads. He had no knowledge whatever of what it was like to deal with ordinary working class kids. Would you, if you had taught classes at Glasgow Academy and been a crammer at Fettes College? I would question the regulations that allow someone like that to run education in a large industrial authority. This is not to say he was not able - he was, extraordinarily intelligent and articulate, and wrote excellent reports and memoranda. He gave me great backing because I think he respected what I was trying to do. But his own knowledge of how schools operated was necessarily limited.
7. The better-off, more educated parents saw it as a dilution of all they thought was best in older schools respected for their long academic tradition. A lot of teachers were not keen at all because they weren't used to dealing with the 'yobs', as they called less able pupils. In that atmosphere of resistance, comprehensive schools did not get off to a flying start.
9. I had complete latitude. Nobody ever interfered with what I did. Many outsiders didn't know enough to interfere in any case. I wish I had had outside help in getting rid of useless teachers, to whom I was ruthless.
10. The only ones who thought it was a bad move were those who saw it as endangering the cherished senior secondary schools. It's very difficult to put into words how highly these schools were

regarded, to the detriment of all others. In the days of the 'quali', I've seen grown men actually weeping when they discovered their son was going to a junior secondary. Apart from those, most parents weren't encouraged to come near schools by a lot of heads at that time, so changes in education were just accepted and parental opinion was never sought. It's only comparatively recently that heads have realised how beneficial it is to take parents with you.

11. The major implication for many in education was that the senior secondaries were under siege, so segregation according to ability was reinforced to protect their local prestige and academic reputation. Many heads never ran comprehensive schools at all. there was a great deal of slackness in what was tolerated of staff teaching less able. What passed as education was sometimes dreadful. As long as teachers didn't give the head any trouble and protected the interests of the able, all was well. In contrast, my staff never knew the minute I'd drop in to a class and sit at the back.
16. Most did not commit themselves on the subject to me, since they knew I was a comprehensive supporter, but my impression was that elitism and the academic tradition reigned among their ranks, with the result that average and less able pupils got little encouragement, and just had to get by.
17. The only real change was that all went to one school. Not much changed in what happened when they got there, though. The overriding impression was of splitting kids into ability groups,

with the main effort concentrated on future certificate passes, and the rest treated with indifference or disdain in general. (This in no way criticises the many excellent teachers who really did try hard with these kids, but I am talking in general terms.)

18. Segregation according to ability is certainly easier, as long as each group gets the best teaching, materials, resources etc the school has to offer. All abilities, whatever they are, should be spotted and developed. I was too old when the notion of mixed-ability classes came in. I think if I had been younger, I'd have given it a good try, but I'd imagine much of the success depends on the teacher - as it always does.
19. Highly doubtful. I think there was a lot of talk with little action. Most teachers were not prepared for what was involved in the change and, when its implications were pointed out, were not inclined to embrace the comprehensive philosophy.
20. As far as I could see, there was no widespread evidence of a radical shift in what went on in classrooms. Younger, enthusiastic teachers tried but against a tide of opposition from more senior colleagues.
21. Not very well. Apart from the fact that there was no more branding of pupils at 12, the arrival of comprehensive schools made little difference as far as I could see. Marked changes were not apparent in the system.
22. This is a concept which in its broadest sense (i.e. not merely

opportunity for the able) meets much favour in theory, but it needs a committed headteacher backed by a hardworking staff to make it work. The role of the headteacher is so crucial. This fact is regrettably overlooked by many a selection committee. If people will not, or cannot, teach all children in a fair way, they should be got rid of. Equality of opportunity in schools had two faces: what was supposed to happen, and what actually happened. You must remember that deep discussions about the meaning of education and what schools should be trying to do rarely occur in schools, either formally or informally. Those who do participate in such discussions are the exception. Most ordinary teachers do not question much.

POSTSCRIPT

Junior secondary schools were awful places in the main. The good ones were rare, and usually hit the headlines. Bad teachers were always sent there rather than to senior secondaries, and better staff who got a junior secondary posting saw it as some kind of punishment for not going to church or being active in the Labour Party. Most of the staff in junior secondary schools were waiting for the day they got out, the same as the pupils they taught. The senior secondary school was always the 'king of the castle', so to speak, without a shadow of a doubt. You can't wonder why - they had pupils who would work because they had some ability, and had set their sights on a degree or a good job, even working class kids. So, for a teacher who loved to transmit his subject, there was only one place to be if you wanted job satisfaction. There just wasn't the challenge in junior secondaries. they were largely holding operations which had no public esteem whatever.

As an instance, the effect of upgrading ----- Central to ----- High was marvellous. It was helped because of the creation of the Ordinary grade - a tangible objective for many pupils who had been told they were failures at 12. (Incidentally, my son-in-law failed his 11+ in England, and became a professor of education. That doesn't exactly inspire faith in selection procedures, does it?). The 'quali' was a very chancy business, and not every primary head adopted the same criteria in drawing up transfer schedules. We got excellent Scottish Certificate of Education results from the 'quali rejects', indeed they sometimes did significantly better than some of their pals who had gone to the local senior secondary at 12. That shows you what a school can achieve when it has an aim and works like hell to achieve it. What is also worth recording is that not all senior secondary heads were equally open-minded when our 4th year pupils went up to do secondary 5/6 with them. Some didn't want to know because of where they had been.

1. The first moves in Lanarkshire came when it 'was in the air', not before. There suddenly was staffroom and public discussion.
2. Politically, the Labour Party were in favour, and they got the support of those members of staff who held similar views. But I doubt if the general bulk of the public moved on the matter.
3. It had no impact whatever, as far as I can see.
4. There was a mounting national concern about less able pupils. There definitely was an anti-privilege lobby. Also people began to question seriously the efficacy of selection procedures operating at the primary 7/secondary 1 changeover.
5. It publication was discussed.
6. 1) They were not a pushy bunch. They paid very few visits to schools.
2) No meetings were held.
3) Relations with the Director in Lanarkshire were very bad indeed. He has a gruff, abrasive manner. There was not much contact between himself and schools, except on non-controversial issues like building. As an indication of feelings about the Director, committees set up to examine certain topics just ignored him - and he didn't seem to mind too much.

7. The existence of the old junior secondary/senior secondary system. There was a tradition of fixed subjects and traditional subjects. All the organisation was well-tried and tested along these lines. After Ordinary grade arrived, there was a bit of loosening up, a bit more variety. A big problem for headteachers was trying to incorporate a greater variety of courses to a traditional timetable structure.
8. Active members of the Labour Party and members of the profession who aligned themselves with socialist doctrines. Those were the teachers readiest to adapt, adjust and experiment. Headmasters' meetings, often unofficial, were important I suppose. A lot of theoretical experimental work was done on paper to stimulate the communication of ideas.
9. We were allowed to do what we liked - there was absolutely no interference or domination from above. We never, in fact, reached the borders of our own autonomy. There were no policy directives, so that changes which took place were purely internal, at the whim of each headmaster. The main pressures came from the existence of the exam system and from within the school - i.e. recalcitrant colleagues.
10. Their main concern was: how will this change affect my kids? Teachers who had had experience only of privileged schools were very against being pushed out of their comfortable rut.
13. There was a genuine movement towards the creation of a common course, but there were differences according to individual subjects - e.g. Maths, Modern Languages. I think the common

course was very important in breaking down initial barriers, even though it was known that children would be 'sorted out later'. They could always meet in other places, e.g. football teams, clubs etc.

15. They co-existed quite happily. Nobody in the state sector bothered about them. The numbers of children they took never in my opinion materially affected the spread of ability in state schools. We always had plenty of able local kids whose parents were perfectly happy that they should be educated with us.
16. Headteachers and teachers could be divided into 3 basic groups:
 - a) those whose views were blinkered by the senior secondary syndrome, and who took no pleasure in thinking of widening the group of children who were admitted to secondary schools.
 - b) a more liberal group, aligned with the above, but who were troubled by their conscience.
 - c) those passionately in favour of comprehensive schools, even if it entailed a chaotic revolution.

Some of the best teachers were set against it. The younger ones were in favour of comprehensive schools - sometimes passionately. They made a real endeavour to make the best of a new situation in the face of opposition from their older, more traditional colleagues. The most difficult thing to break down was the strong academic tradition in Scottish secondary schools which had a noble pedigree. In any case, most teachers do not countenance ANY change with a favourable eye, they're so conservative on the whole.

18. This question is inseparable from the existence of a national exam system. In some cases, pupils are marked out as early as secondary 1 as either 'future passes' or 'no chancers'. Because of this, I think that academically-minded staff have a grudge against too long a period of orientation in the early years. Although much depends on the subject you teach.
21. It was, I suppose, philosophically easy to accept the comprehensive idea in Scotland. Old myths die hard - equality of class, the parish school and all that. It is only fair, however, to point out that there were differences between urban and rural areas - omnibus schools v. junior secondary/senior secondary split.
22. It was interpreted as the opportunity to show what you could do academically, irrespective of your social origin. Here, the influence of both the home and the peer group were crucial.
23. a) It meant the end of the process of labelling pupils as 'WORTHY' or 'UNWORTHY'. It was a most significant end of the iniquitous system of segregation at primary 7 which had hitherto obtained. Junior secondary schools never enjoyed the same resources, facilities or status. There was never enough life among junior secondary staff to make these schools a success. They had different salaries, after all. Junior secondary schools proved to be an ill-conceived failure in the Scottish educational system. The arrival of comprehensive schools meant that all pupils now got the same initial chance - this was a step for the good.

1. Comprehensive education was a topic of great discussion in society but not in schools in Lanarkshire in the 1960s. The Director was against comprehensive schools. He favoured a two-tier system as a sort of halfway house. Junior secondary schools were nightmarish places. Gradually it became a matter of politics. Labour councillors did not understand the first thing about the whole thing. They pushed slogan terms like 'all-though', 'equality of opportunity' merely as slogans. There was no open resistance but silent opposition, because the ideas being pushed were against assessable teacher opinion. It was a whole new ball game.
2. There was no groundswell of opinion in senior secondary schools for a move to comprehensive education. They understandably wanted the status quo. There was in my recollection no teacher lobby for the introduction of comprehensive education. Scottish teachers thought the senior secondary/junior secondary system was fair, and certainly fairer than the English system. A lot of pro-comprehensive feelings were whipped up from the politicians by the media.
3. The 1947 Report was a document to be read at university or college when writing essays. Things were not discussed much. The authoritarian educational system was acceptable then. Nowadays the political overrides the educational in education.
4. Egalitarian ideas spread in the 1960s. The warcry was that

everyone should be the same. Everybody had to have the same opportunities. It was part and parcel of the mood of the times. Also, education was at the forefront of the Labour Party's platform when it won the election in 1964.

5. Things did not happen overnight. The change coincided with a period of staff shortage. Schools were ill-prepared for the move; in fact many schools remained untouched for a considerable period. The development towards a comprehensive system of education was uneven except in new purpose-built schools. Accommodation and buildings caused headaches. Not the least of matters was a marked resistance among many teachers, who showed an unwillingness to bend their old ways. The whole enterprise was inadequately funded. A lot of good Brunton courses were lost because comprehensive schools came in the middle. All that happened for a long time was that children stopped going to separate schools. The whole push was on Scottish Certificate of Education work and pupils, even after reorganisation on comprehensive lines.
6. a) Her Majesty's Inspectors had an advisory role. They set up working parties and held courses and conferences to look at the implications for schools of Circulars 600 and 614. But they were chosen because they were the right mould for the Scottish Education Department. A lot was left to local authorities.
- b) Many moderate Labour councillors were against comprehensive schools. The more radical beat down the attempts of their moderate colleagues to slow things down.

- c) In Lanarkshire, the Director was not in favour of change to all-through schools. All his proposals for alternatives were defeated.
- d) Advisers came much later. Their success or otherwise was bound up with their personalities. I never felt they were really necessary, more an unnecessary extra bureaucratic tier. Once created, they had to justify their existence. 'Much ado about nothing' all in all.
7. The attitude of staff was by far the most intractable problem. Senior secondary staff were horrified at having to see, never mind teach former junior secondary pupils. Vested interests were strong. There was, in addition, no preparation of curricula more appropriate to the new arrangements. A conflict of aspirations developed, and the question was who was to get priority - Scottish Certificate of Education or non-Scottish Certificate of Education pupils? The latter got a very watered-down menu. The second biggest obstacle in Lanarkshire was accommodation. My school had 25 huts and annex buildings.
9. Heads had a great deal of freedom initially. Some interference and pressure came from people about the common course and mixed-ability. But I kept grading my intake until 1974/5 - a long breathing space to adapt to the new ways. Most schools' option structure was geared to the requirements of senior secondary kids.
10. Only a small proportion of parents are ever interested in education at any one time. Many parents do not care. The bulk

of parents I met did not want the former senior secondary schools to lose their reputation for getting good Scottish Certificate of Education passes and sending senior pupils to University. The most vocal critics were middle-class parents.

11. The private sector is so small in the West that I doubt if it had much real effect. The quality of education offered in senior secondary schools in their heyday was outstanding, and just as good as what was on offer in private schools.
12. Most new practices happened and got a fair deal in the new purpose-built schools. In comprehensives formed from amalgamations of senior secondary and junior secondary schools, old traditions died very hard and very slowly. Not much development really took place there.
13. In-service really began to make an impact after raising of the school leaving age.
14. a) Heads, in general, were less than enthusiastic about the whole idea.

b) For teachers, it depended where you taught, and what your experience was. There are not too many people in teaching genuinely dedicated to giving the academic underdogs a hand. Most teachers get academic fulfilment from working with able children who want to go for Scottish Certificate of Education exams.

15. Yes, junior secondary/senior secondary pupils tended to still be separated, even in comprehensive schools. Relaxation was seen at its most evident in the gradual erosion of barriers to sit Ordinary grade. This gave the junior secondary pupils worthwhile goals. This, of course, led to huge presentation figures and banded Ordinary grades.
17. a) Yes, the curriculum, did change, especially after raising of the
+
b) school leaving age. Methods changes came in the form of an invasion of audio-visual equipment, to which great lip-service was paid, but which in fact gathered dust. Extra teaching aids and resources just bring a different set of problems. They become restrictive to good teaching and are eventually abandoned. In some subjects, the emphasis was shifted to different skills.
19. There was far greater uniformity in the Scottish educational system. It was always characterised by wider access to all classes. The Scottish Education Department exercised benevolent central control over it, and Her Majesty's Inspectors helped a great deal to unify it. So the comprehensive idea has been around in Scotland for a long time. Many famous ones can be seen in small towns like Brechin, Arbroath, Peebles, Callander. The really new factor was questioning how to deal with a broad ability spectrum in one school and, of course, schools of an undreamt-of size.
20. The lad 'o' pairts idea is still deep-rooted in our national mentality. Equality of opportunity thus means putting the onus on the pupil to make the best of what ability he has. The

problem comes with pupils whose background does not offer support, or is anti-school. They usually are not motivated to improve themselves. The Scottish system has a proud tradition of rewarding those with ability with academic success. The arrival of the comprehensive school gave all (and more) children an absolutely fair start in the educational race.

21. A comprehensive school should be no bigger than 1,000 pupils, and offer a range of courses to be within the capabilities of all of them. But the mistake should not be made of trying to teach the same things to all. Differentiation should be introduced as soon as possible.

22. No. the main impediments to realising the full potential of the comprehensive school have been:

- staff attitudes and inflexibility
- staff shortage and lack of resources
- financial cutbacks in public sector
- siting of schools in 'bad' areas
- the loss to the profession of able recruits.

The comprehensive school was an idealistic notion that was introduced on political whim, without sufficient account being taken of the realities of school life. The period in question was assailed by a multiplicity of changes and a coincidence of innovation. The politicians did not put their money where their mouths were, and certainly did not consider the presence in the system of powerful and genuine obstacles.

1. All the talk began in earnest around 1963-4. Nothing was mentioned about comprehensive schools before that date. The old system just rolled on.
2. There were some educationists who were actively promoting the supposed educational advantages of the comprehensive school - more in England than Scotland as I recall. When it came up to this part of the world (Lanarkshire) it was seized by the Labour Party, and became an emphatically political issue. The whole switch over was based on the assumption that junior secondary pupils were at a disadvantage, as they could not sit national exams, and so were denied the opportunity to 'get on' in life. The qualifying exam was seen to be inaccurate (a fact). The whole movement in my view arose here because so many junior secondary schools were perceived to be second-rate institutions, which could not bestow any advantage, academic or otherwise, on their pupils, whereas the senior secondary could, and was the door to success and opportunity. The comprehensive movement came about because of feelings of injustice at the split educational set up which operated. An awareness of this strengthened the determination of our political masters to remove segregation in Scottish secondary education.
3. There was not a very emphatic mention of the comprehensive school in the 1947 Report, which as I recall presented a very idealistic picture of what education could do in certain circumstances. It never really caused a stir, because it did not reflect

educational reality as people knew it.

4. Definitely political. I do not recall much agitation in the world of education for comprehensive schools.
5. Circular 600 made hardly any difference in ---- school. We had already experienced an intermediate stage of changeover from our dealings with ---- High School. The headteacher there with his drive and determination turned average pupils into something better, even better than some of our own pupils. So ---- had already had injected into it an element of pupils from ---- who were not intellectually superior but middle-of-the-road, who could hold their own with ours because they had been well-prepared. So ---- had already begun to experience a dilution in quality of its pupil intake, albeit at secondary 4 stage. Add to that the fact that the authority was very generous in who it let come to us from ---, and you can see that Circular 600 did not represent any sudden plunge into the unknown for my staff. The whole nature of --- gradually began to change, so that, by the time comprehensive education was officially introduced, we were already familiar with pupils of lesser ability. By gradually changing from a senior secondary, then taking ---- High's Ordinary grade success, then presenting our own pupils for Ordinary through to becoming completely comprehensive, we were able to assimilate newcomers of lesser ability into the ethos of the school. Perhaps we were a little fortunate too in our catchment area - our kids were usually reasonable.
6. 1) I have no recollection of Her Majesty's Inspectors having any

influence on educational policy until raising of the school leaving age came along. Then there were directives and discussions. My experience of them was that they came to conduct visits to see what was going on - to pick up ideas if you like. They never exerted pressure to conform to any particular viewpoint.

- 2) It was clear that they were very happy with the new comprehensive philosophy, but they never stepped in to affect educational procedures in ---. They did become involved in the jockeying for position over catchment areas for ---- and ---- and tried to favour the latter at the expense of the former.
- 3) Not really to start with. Their usefulness varied according to individuals. In fairness, they tried to be as useful as they could, but much depended on the sort of principal teacher they were dealing with. They had to keep a low profile when confronted with positively-minded traditional principal teachers. They also intervened to help departments who were getting an unfair deal from heads.
- 4) We had an entirely free hand. There was no positive lead. ---- was happy to give schools a lot of scope. The only time I remember anything which could be termed 'policy' coming from him was his paper on guidance - that was really laid on the line. It was over-idealistic in conception, because the plain fact was that many of the people he appointed just were not capable of rising to the standards he had set out in his documents. Guidance staff tried to set themselves up as a group without any reference to the headteacher - a very independent-minded lot. I resented the sort of 'clique' image which they tried to give, and

the fact that some of them withheld what they considered confidential information about some of my pupils.

7. Mixed-ability classes in the junior school. This was highly controversial. In my view educationists have placed too high an expectation upon the possibilities of academic development on the whole spectrum of pupils. They should have faced up the the plain fact that most processes that go on in the classroom are of no significance to one third of the pupils, the more so when they go home. The gap between the school and the home is very wide for a lot of pupils, much wider than most people in education realise. I am sceptical of much of the curriculum development that took place in the 1960s. The curriculum should be predominantly practical/aesthetic for the less able - at least three quarters. The assumption that merely by sending all kids to a comprehensive school you will raise the intellectual aspirations and standards of all has been sadly misplaced. A basic fact remains: there are pupils who can and pupils who cannot - this is a fundamental truth. The problem of how to introduce all children to an academic framework that has evolved over centuries to the benefit of the gifted or academic able child has not yet been satisfactorily solved. Some pupils are socially immature, with regard to duties and responsibilities to homework. Homework was a positive element in the old senior secondary school - now it's gone. I'm not sure that this is a healthy development. This is all linked to woolly and ill-conceived theories of ways to group children. Mixed-ability groups were accepted without adequate - or any? - research, and a lot of people who should have known better had foisted on them as

well the assumption - that's all it is - that academic pursuits will be able to be made attractive to a diluted school population. As a result, the intellectual quality of what goes on in schools has gone down. For example, you can go to University now without having read Hamlet or Lycidas or Chaucer, your teachers having been content with the much less demanding Wilfred Owen or Arthur Miller. These easier options are symptomatic of a thinning of the intellectual depth of school work which has been brought about by allowing academically less able pupils into a secondary school.

9. I had complete latitude - this was important. No-one told me what to do or how to run my school. I was the Captain of the ship, to use a well-worn metaphor.
10. The reactions were what you would have anticipated: the parents of able kids saw it as a deterioration, a decline of a well-established school, the introduction of pupils with lower academic and social standards. The parents of the less able were delighted that their kids now could go to a school where they could show what they could do, whether academically or in the extra-curricular field. The corporate life of a school is very important. Those who do not accept this view are wrong. The despised and rejected in academic terms must have a chance of finding a place in the sun, whether in a play, a team a club or whatever. It was a deliberate policy of mine to develop this side of school life in order to provide something for those whom academic laurels were destined to elude.

12. To a great extent dependent on the social composition of the catchment area, and also the problem of a split site school, if you had to cope with it, as many Lanarkshire headteachers had.
13. The majority of staff continued to concentrate their efforts on able certificate pupils and on their presentation classes in the upper school. It's fair to say that they did not rate their obligations to less able pupils as high on their list of priorities. They didn't lose any sleep over them, as long as no harm came to their place to work with the abler citizens. You could say that less academic kids just weren't taken seriously in any educational sense. The result was that these pupils found themselves sitting in front of teachers who really had no interest in teaching them. So they got no individual attention or respect, had mediocre or poor materials, just had to get by as best they could. Hence, they enjoyed neither self-respect nor respect by staff and felt no sense of achievement or purpose. I did not like to see this, but it happened.
14. The effort that went into the organisation of in-service training was most commendable, and there is no doubt that a lot of it was directed against dispelling the elitist views with which former senior secondary schools were riddled. The effects of it all, however, were very variable. My impression was that practical subjects benefited more from advisory effort than the academic ones.
15. Hamilton Academy took 23 pupils per year from local primaries when I became headteacher at -----School. Parents were

impressed by the aura the Academy had - there is no doubt that it was viewed as superior, and this caused resentment in other equally good schools with equally competent heads and staffs. The headmasters of local primary schools took obvious pride in the number of their pupils accepted for Hamilton Academy each year. But Hamilton Academy caused an unhealthy, mutual hostility amongst secondary schools in Lanarkshire. Its pupils had an obvious air of superiority in relations with pupils from other schools. This made me vow to show our parents that my school was every bit as good as H.A., especially in respect of external exams and the Bursary Competition. Maybe this was too high in my list of priorities, but latterly I was only losing four pupils to Hamilton Aacdemy. I have to admit that I took a childish pleasure from the fact that ---- came first in the Bursary Competition, and that a contemporary of our 1st place winner at primary school had gone to Hamilton A,cademy and came only 40th. It's terrible to say that, but that's how I felt.

All these thoughts of the glorious past make me sad when I consider the low repute in which many comprehensive schools are held both by parents and staff, who are having serious doubts about their educational viability, and especially about the effects of the less able majority on the able minority. Can we honestly say that they do not suffer? We should, therefore, not be surprised at the growth in the private sector, cheered on by the present government, which seems happy to sit on the sidelines and cheer on the progressive dismantling of the state educational machine.

17. Headteachers were critical for many years of the effects of the

foisting of a comprehensive system on them. They frequently quoted a progressive deterioration in their schools, and were deeply pessimistic about the future of Scottish education. The Headteachers' Association of Scotland tried desperately to oppose Circular 600 and even sent strongly-worded appeals to the Secretary of State - to no avail, as it happened. Faced with a political reality, therefore, they accepted it but with reluctance, and did their best to live with the implications. It would not be an exaggeration to say that for many headteachers and their staffs - given their own education background, training and career - the change to comprehensive education assumed traumatic proportions, which left their mark on many.

17. It is difficult to be general here. In many schools, demarcation lines between certificate and non-certificate pupils were firmly drawn. In others, wiser in my view, the boundaries were softer, and pupils merged more. As always, which way a school went depended so much on the educational philosophy and practice of the head.
18. The effect of mixed-ability grouping in secondary 1/2 has to be that the subject matter in most subjects undergoes changes. Selection into ability groups must take place by the start of secondary 3 at the latest. Secondary 1/2 inevitably must be watered down to an extent which allows all children to show what their strengths and weaknesses are in all subjects. In any case, most able children burgeon at 15/16 - they are too immature at 13/14 to know what they want to do or where they want to go. There is no need to lay solid foundations of a subject in

secondary 1/secondary 2. It should be a time of enjoyment and finding out what pupils like, and can or cannot do. Above all, it should not be dominated by exams. However, many teachers whose aim is success at secondary 5 in ----- would not share this view.

19. It depends on the individual. In recent years there have been far more changes than at the start, e.g. departmental meetings, which hardly ever happened in senior secondary schools. A gradual awareness of the magnitude of the problems initiated by a switch to comprehensive education manifested itself in lots of ways - the Green Paper, Guidance, and a general increase in the 'management approach' to running schools with plenty of textbooks to tell you how it should be done! But the fact remains that many subject departments had only one policy: CATER FOR THE ABLE ABOVE ALL. They did not budge from former elitist conceptions, and thus weaker children academically got short changed.
21. It didn't to any great extent. The traditional notion died hard - viz. life in school was a conflict from day one, the whole point was the survival of the educationally fittest. Children had to be pushed as hard as possible so as to be able through education to rise above the social position of their birth. The lad o' pairts lives in 1985 - education is THE escape route to better things in life than your father had or could afford. It was a cut-throat atmosphere in which the prize was academic success - which, of course, was an indirect tribute to their ability to teach! Thus, you can imagine how devastating the educational theory in Circular 600 must have appeared in 1965!

Its inbuilt ideas of equality, equal respect for all, ability not nearing just academic ability were nothing short of revolutionary for the teaching force that that was expected to implement it. Hence the upsurge in new curricula and even new subjects.

22. An obligation to all, not just the potential doctors, lawyers and architects. The able can no longer be the be-all and end-all if it's a really comprehensive school you are running. It's a slow process of change in attitudes for teachers to a realisation that school as a world solely for the elite in ability is forever shattered. The Christian, compassionate view of man must reject the lad o' pairs view of education as the preserve of only the able. Whilst the latter must never be neglected, they must never receive a disproportionate share of teacher effort or school time. You really cannot defend educational favouritism on any criterion. Not neglecting the able is not synonymous with setting them aside for special attention.
22. There is an inherent disparity between all pupils. The basic idea is that no child of intellectual ability should ever be denied the chance to succeed. But there has been much muddled thinking associated with the (mistaken in my opinion) view that all will emulate the able and benefit from those same opportunities, if only they can grasp them. This has not - and plainly cannot - happen in the real world.
23. A comprehensive school is one in which the educational processes adopted are not such as would deny any child the full development of his potential, whatever that is. In a good comprehensive

school, there is an open recognition of the right of every child to develop whatever talent he has, whether it is academic or not. There can be no place for a narrow theory of academic elitism. A comprehensive school by definition is a heterogeneous mob which differs in many respects, and which must be allowed to develop its individual interests and aptitudes. In a true comprehensive school, no one fails, because each can do something. In a true comprehensive school there is no such thing as unhappiness among pupils due to inability to meet solely academic criteria.

The curriculum cannot be the sole priority in a comprehensive school. Other things are equally important.

- 1) social and moral education
- 2) the creation of a HAPPY community - teachers and heads have this very much in their power
- 3) education for leisure.

24. The potential of the comprehensive school has not so far been tapped due to

- a) staff shortage; you must have a plethora of staff to cater for the diversity inherent in a comprehensive school
- b) the lack of the proper vision of education among staff, i.e. equal responsibility to ALL pupils instead of the able minority who will achieve success in Scottish Certificate of Education exams
- c) bad appointments to posts of responsibility.

I am convinced that the wrong criteria are employed in making appointments. What people say often counts much more than what they have actually achieved or can do with pupils in a classroom. The key things are ADAPTABILITY and VERSATILITY in teachers.

Interviews - and interviewees - have failed to recognise this fact, and hence do not look for the essential qualities - VERVE and ENTHUSIASM.

PREAMBLE

Her Majesty's Inspectors took no part as far as I could see in starting a movement for comprehensive schools. They essentially did two things: inspected schools and gave advice. They were a reticent bunch, who hardly ever opened their mouths. They were essentially 1st class honours people, often Classics or English, who were isolates, not good mixers. Very good at writing reports and attending meetings. Paper is their forte. I was becoming outspoken, and my seniors told me I should 'tone it down' if I was looking for promotion. So I got out and back into schools.

1. Comprehensive education is a product of socialist thinking, and had nothing to do with schools. Any feelings for it came from small junior secondary schools in poor areas where life was hell: a comprehensive school could only be better than that, even if people weren't exactly sure what it meant. The advent of comprehensive ideas destroyed excellent schools with long traditions of academic excellence. At one time, ----- had about 20 of its staff who were former pupils of Hamilton Academy, you know! But teachers were presented with a fait accompli. They did very little overtly to oppose what was being imposed on them.
2. The moves were without a shadow of a doubt political. The opponents - teachers - didn't have the push or the muscle of the proponents - the politicians. So that was it! It was decreed that schools were to become comprehensive. Brunton and Dickson

(HMSCI/HMDSCI) were no great comprehensive sympathisers. They did what their political masters told them. They were front men, public speakers, but it was difficult to find a strong pro-comprehensive lobby among the Inspectorate either when I joined or when I left. The Inspectorate is full of cliques, the 'in-groups' out for promotion. Some of them have damn all to contribute in terms of educational thinking.

3. Every school had the 1947 Report in a cupboard somewhere. It was no more than that. It had hardly any effect. JJ Robertson had to temper his views for the establishment. There must be a basic realisation in education: you cannot train racehorses and carthorses together. There has to be some modification in what is taught and how it is taught. Schools and teachers operate in a structure which is given. There is little room for manoeuvre. JJR's report tried vainly to give senior Scottish Education Department staff good advice. It had nothing to do with comprehensive education which, as I have said, was a political decision imposed on schools which had grown up in a strong academic tradition for almost a century, under the strong influence of Universities and their entrance requirements.
4. Comprehensive education came into vogue because of the tremendous influence socialist ideas, which held sway in many sections of society. Feelings that some people in society were being denied their rightful opportunity were spread about and gained popularity. Ordinary people began, as a result, to develop aspirations for their children, whom they wanted to see in respectable professions.

5. The implications of Circular 600? Kids caused hell upon earth for teachers, in a word! Discipline slackened and pupils voiced opposition to education in schools. The ability range broadened, and this introduced many into schools who were unsuited for education of an academic kind the question was: HOW DO YOU EDUCATE THEM? WHAT CAN WE FIND FOR THEM TO DO? Some experimentalists like R F MacKenzie did come up with good answers, but this was the exception. A lot people just found things for them to do to occupy their time, nothing more, nothing less. Some of the things that went on were scandalous!
6. b) Local politicians followed the party line. Labour ones nearly all wore rose-coloured spectacles, believing education would bring the dawning of a new age. Very few had a clue about the real world caused by a political decision - that many teachers were confronted by tasks they couldn't begin to face successfully.
- c) While they all had their own ideas, they were largely figureheads who gave talks at meetings and wrote articles in journals. The only one I ever met who had any real philosophy he was prepared to break rules for was Stewart MacKintosh in Glasgow. Mostly they deal with bureaucratic matters like budgets, staffing quotas etc., and don't take much to do with what happens in schools.
- d) The best advisers were those who did not have their heads in the clouds, but kept both feet on the ground, and those who did what they were supposed to do - be out and about in schools, not sitting desk-bound in the office. A minority fell into this

category.

- e) The Consultative Committee on the Curriculum had little influence. Most ordinary teachers don't read educational reports anyway, and for many it was a question of survival in the classroom or experimental approaches in the classroom. Needless to say, the former won at the expense of the latter. To adopt Consultative Committee on the Curriculum ideas would have added hugely to most teachers' problems. If you are going to face a room full of twits at 10.15 the last thing you need is a Consultative Committee on the Curriculum Report in your hand!
7. The two most important implications of comprehensive education were:
- a) the widespread inability or failure of teachers to know what to do in the face of change
 - b) growing indiscipline and disaffection among pupils who could not cope with the education they were given. Such were the results of the Labour Party decree.
9. Headteachers were in sole charge of their schools, and it was up to them to get on with it. You got directives from the office, but effectively you could do as you liked, as long as parents or councillors didn't complain to the Director or the Education Committee.
10. ----- parents were not wild about the comprehensive principle. They liked the idea of a senior high school which was there to get their children Ordinary and Higher passes, away from the distractions of louts and layabouts. The two-tier system was a

very clever plan. It appeared to be one way of responding to Circular 600, while getting round the problem of wildly differing abilities. Children need rivalry to maintain academic standards. Going comprehensive dealt a fatal blow to some of the best schools in Scotland. Look what happened to Hamilton Academy, Glasgow High Of course, there was a great deal of rivalry and jealousy between the senior high school and the junior schools which fed it - but you just accepted that as a fact of life.

12. Internal change depended entirely on the headteacher. The man at the top of a school is crucial. Some dreadful appointments were - and still are probably - made to headteacher posts, not because of a dearth of good people, but because the Directorate and politicians machinate to ensure that they do not get on at the expense of 'their' choice of candidate. Some headteachers were - and are - walking disasters, but they can't be got rid of! A major problem in education, in my opinion.
13. Discipline and order is the key to successful curriculum development. In-service courses gave teachers plenty of ideas, but had nothing to say on behaviour aspects, so did not have much real influence. If the kids are against you, and do not want to know, it doesn't matter what trendy ideas or equipment you have, does it?
14. a) Some headteachers fought like hell to get improvements. Those that were keen to change got encouragement and financial assistance from the Directorate and Advisers, both therefore

diverting their attention from schools that were slower to respond to the comprehensive clarion call. They backed 'winners', as they saw them.

b) Since comprehensive education made most teachers' life a misery, it was hardly popular. For many, it was an interruption to what they saw as their main task - helping kids who wanted to get on. In some schools, it was synonymous with hell on earth. Worsened working conditions, about which you can do nothing, don't tend to go down all that well.

15. In merged schools, the extent of the senior secondary/junior secondary blend was entirely at the discretion of the headteacher and his staff.

16. a) A lot of kidology went on about this grouping business. Much
b) lip-service was paid and a lot was claimed to be happening. In reality, the old divisions remained either blatantly or thinly disguised. In those schools that did experimental work with grouping children, the question you had to ask was: HOW MUCH REAL EDUCATION IS GOING ON HERE? WHAT IS BEING ACCOMPLISHED?

17. a) Yes, both curriculum and methods have changed, but not as
b) fundamentally as some people would have us believe. Teachers were expected to implement fairly radical conceptual changes in impossible situations, e.g. old buildings, staff shortage, oversize classes etc. The expectations of those pushing for change took no account of the realities in which teachers had to work. Because teachers are usually co-operative, they

accomplished quite a lot, often against the odds.

19. The comprehensive school was a totally different idea, as envisaged by the socialists, from all that Scottish education had stood for since the days of John Knox, i.e. selecting able children, and grooming them for higher education. The socialist idea has caused a marked dilution in standards as a result of bringing a wide spread of ability together in one school. Organisational or structural change cannot compensate for or remedy lack of ability or an unsupportive home background. These things cannot be legislated against, and that's a fact, however unpleasant it is to face.
20. Equality of opportunity I am sure was seen as extending the chance for more children to join the selected groups going on to work for Scottish Certificate of Education exams. The problem of what to do with junior secondary pupils is still unsolved. What schools can do in the face of blatant indifference to what they have to offer is limited.
21. A comprehensive school is one which takes all children from a defined area and delays creating homogeneous classes based on ability for one year at the most. Any longer a delay militates against getting high standards of attainment. Mixed-ability grouping has very few virtues that I can see. Kids group themselves according to background, ability and interests anyway. Artificial non-segregation according to ability works against all kids, and does them a huge disservice. There is no doubt of that. It is difficult to see a solution. But senior secondary

schools were excellent at getting very able pupils Scottish Certificate of Education passes, and sending them on to University. Comprehensive schools have proved an undoubted setback to training the able for greater things - at least in urban areas if not in small towns. There are four prerequisites of any good school - a long tradition of academic success, a good staff and head, keen pupils and caring parents.

1. I'm not sure I know where initiatives to introduce the comprehensive school began, but I have no doubt that it was an external decision not taken by teachers.
2. All educational changes of any importance are political. A lot of Labour MPs were former teachers on the left in the Educational Institute of Scotland. Most major changes are forced through on a tide of feeling because the time is never right. If politicians waited till circumstances were right, the ideas would be out of date. I was not aware of any agitation among the teaching force to get comprehensive schools started. There certainly was widespread unhappiness in and about the junior secondary school, but no one to my knowledge had worked out that the comprehensive school was the solution to the problem. It was a very new idea in urban areas.
3. Any influence the 1947 Report had would have been on politicians or Scottish Education Department officials. It certainly did not reach your average teacher, or change the daily life in schools. It was a good educational document with ideas which were implemented only in those schools with go-ahead headteachers. It did not cause a stir.
4. The 'big thing' in the 1960s was the increasing popularity of egalitarian dogma. It shot to prominence in the media. Also, dissatisfaction with the 11+ or 'quali' up here began to make people realise that many children had been 'written off' by the

educational system for years. There was a general feeling of unfairness and injustice. I think that the Labour Party seized on this dissatisfaction and turned it into an issue to its electoral advantage.

5. The main implication of Circular 600 was that the junior secondary/senior secondary system was doomed, and that both types of school were integrated to form comprehensive schools. But the death of separate schooling was slow, and the old forms were still alive and recognisable in the new comprehensive set-up. There was a gradual realisation that things were going to change, but the teaching profession, being very conservative, does not take well to change, especially when it is externally imposed. For teachers in senior secondary schools, Circular 600 represented the end of the line for their cosy comfortable existence; now they would have to deal with the educational 'dregs', and learn how to cope with children the like of which they had never before seen. Some staffs were at a loss, and for some subjects (Modern Languages, Classics, Maths) the comprehensive idea was anathema. The junior secondary schools did well out of it. The stigma attached to these schools transferred itself to the staff, for whom the comprehensive school meant a new lease of life.

6. a) I think that Her Majesty's Inspectors deserve a pat on the back for the promotion job they did for comprehensive education. They are a peculiar body - civil servants who carry out the remit given to them by the government of the day. It is very much a case of getting a specific job done in a certain time. So Her

Majesty's Inspectors appeared all over the place at conferences to sell comprehensive education. They were there to persuade and offer advice, but it was obvious that they sublimated or suppressed their own feelings on the subject.

b) Local politicians had very little influence, but they thought they did. They upheld the comprehensive ideal at party meetings and constituency surgeries.

c) Directors of Education each had their own ideas. Some did their best, others were against it, but had to implement it. I remember that at my interview for my first headteacher job I had talked about how to implement the comprehensive ideal. Privately, afterwards, the Director told me that if I started mixed-ability classes in the school he would personally come down and gut me. Hardly the view of someone keen to promote comprehensive education!

d) Advisers had no impact at the start, but by the 1970s their influence began to be felt.

e) It is very debatable whether the Consultative Committee on the Curriculum and all its committees and publications helped to get comprehensive education launched. It was very much take it or leave it. The influence of the Consultative Committee on the Curriculum was variable.

9. How I ran my school was entirely up to me. Headteachers were left to do their own thing. You were left to implement comprehensive education according to your own interpretation of it. The senior secondary tradition died hard. Everybody

ironically thought they were operating a comprehensive system, but all the trappings of an academic institution were there. Many headteachers paid lip-service to the new idea. After reorganisation a much tougher line was taken and firmer guidelines were laid down.

10. Parents get bees in their bonnet when change in education looks as if is going to affect their children badly. In many years as a headteacher I would say that I have never met a parent who thought comprehensive education was great or terrible. There was no forceful reaction either way. There was a powerful association of schools with their names and status.
11. By and large in the West of Scotland, private schools and fee-paying schools don't matter, and have little effect on the state system. The parents who use these schools would never dream of sending their children to state schools. It was embarrassing, however, to discover teachers and prominent members of the Labour Party sending their offspring to posh schools in order that they could be 'properly stretched'.
12. The junior secondary/senior secondary split persisted for a long time, and there was not much integration across the ability range. The main change was that the possibility of having a crack at an Ordinary grade was extended to all children, when previously some had been debarred. The chance to attempt Ordinary grades was open to all-comers from day one.
13. In-service courses involved much effort, but had a very uneven

impact. Only a minority of teachers were genuinely interested. Most went because they were sent. In-service courses disturbed teachers' thoughts. Most would rather have been in class than learning the latest trendy ideas. There was a lot of suspicion about the preachings of college staff, who hadn't been near a class for years. People were sceptical about how much they knew. Advisers did their best to promote new ideas, but they were a mixed bunch.

14. a) As new headteachers were appointed the general attitude changed, but there was a lot of passive resistance.

b) Teachers, I would say, as a group, were not in favour of comprehensive education when they realised what was entailed. Their opposition was not always silent. I think the arrival of the guidance system helped broaden teachers' views.

16. a) If mixed-ability teaching took off at all, it was not until the mid-1970s. It required great teaching skills, and many teachers were fundamentally opposed to it. Teachers in general do not read books about education or teaching methods etc.

b) By secondary 3/4, pupils had been divided up or had divided themselves. There was a great parental push in the 1970s to sit Ordinary grades, and many staff presented children who had no hope to give them the benefit of the doubt. Nobody was denied a chance. All got their choice and chance.

17. The advent of the comprehensive school did affect the curriculum and methods, but only ultimately. There was a gradual

realisation that old methods and approaches were no bloody use, and much more thought was required to do the job correctly. Enforced comprehensive schooling was a big factor in the change.

18. Teachers had to change their approaches to survive - it was as simple as that.

19. The only real comprehensive schools I have seen are the primaries: secondary schools are obsessed by dividing children according to ability. In that sense, the comprehensive school was a revolutionary idea, even in rural areas with their omnibus schools.

20. In theory, equality of opportunity in Scotland meant that everyone got a chance to benefit from the educational system. In reality the system has always been education according to age, aptitude and ability. The lad o' pairts tradition has been strong.

21. A comprehensive school is one in which all kids are integrated and do the same course till the end of secondary 2. They then self-select suitable courses. All school activities should be open to all children, and all should get a chance to show what they can do, irrespective of their academic ability. The biggest bugbear to comprehensive education has been Scottish Certificate of Education exams. They stop schools from educating children.

22. No, the potential of the comprehensive school has not been fully tapped. Dominant values in society, parental expectations and

external exams have all combined to hamper progress towards a genuine comprehensive system.

I started teaching in ----- High School in 1951. It was a four year school. Able children who wanted to transfer to ---- High School could do so at the end of secondary 2 and secondary 4. A lot of able children were encouraged to stay for the sake of the school's image. This two-tier system was a type of comprehensive schooling. It resulted in a very happy school, which had close links with its community. But there was a great wastage of able pupils, who would have stayed on had there been the opportunity to do Scottish Certificate of Education Higher grade. Many able pupils simply left school. This tendency stopped when full comprehensive education came in.

When I went to the ----- School, an all boys junior secondary school, it was a different story. It was a grey, prison-like building with no facilities. There was a strong criminal core whose court appearances had given the school a national notoriety. It took a couple of weeks for me to restore discipline, and then eventually the silent majority stopped worshipping the few thugs who had run the school until my arrival. We acquired an outdoor centre which made front page news. Her Majesty's Inspectors Report on the school was very good. The top class were presented in four Ordinary grades.

From a national efficiency point of view the old junior secondary/senior secondary split system was almost Russian in conception - identify the best and push them hard to get good results. From a humanitarian point of view, it was deplorable: the (junior secondary) rejects had a chip on their shoulder, and bore the mark for life. Going to a junior secondary school stained people psychologically. They were almost

indecent in their effects.

I also presided over ---- High's gradual conversion from a senior secondary to a comprehensive secondary. I have always tended to the academic view of education, but offered pupils a wider choice. Some of the principal teachers at ---- were died-in-the-wool. They had been teaching the same way for years - rigid courses, Scottish Certificate of Education exams, haggles over who was to be school dux. Hardly any teachers think about education in a philosophical way. I introduced personal profiling, but I am sure that many of the staff didn't appreciate the reasoning behind it. How you viewed comprehensive education depended on where you were at the time: if you were in a junior high school being 'upgraded' to a comprehensive school you felt you now had an objective; if you were in a senior secondary you deplored the body blow to academic excellence and standards, and panic set in at the thought of junior secondary type pupils coming in.

There was no push from the grassroots in the profession for the change to a comprehensive system. It came from left-wing politicians, faceless men working in the background to effect a major educational change. It all had been discussed behind the scenes, under the surface, then the teaching profession was told - WE ARE GOING COMPREHENSIVE. So the motivation was entirely political and the education service had to react. Her Majesty's Inspectors had to change bikes and gear all at once, and get things moving. So the service was forced to react and adapt to a change totally effected by political manoeuvring. So Her Majesty's Inspectors started to push, and it soon became clear that promotions went to those who were seen to be in the van of modern educational thinking. There were pressures for change, but wise

headteachers did not allow themselves to be pushed so that the pendulum swung too far. Equality of opportunity is all very well as an ideal, but who takes the bump that comes in its wake? The later consequences cannot be equal, so my philosophy was to do my best for the less able, but ensure that the brightest were not inhibited from getting good results, so that their life prospects were not damaged by new ideas.

Our Director of Education could handle his politicians and save the education service from the worst excesses of their folly. It's a very different ball-game now in Strathclyde with politicians telling officials what to do. There were good arguments for comprehensive schooling, but because they were espoused as a left-wing cause, a lot of potential support was lost. Politicians did not appreciate the strength of feeling among senior secondary teachers who were set against it from the start. The only people who saw it as a new dawn were teachers in 3 and 4 year schools that stood to gain in status through going comprehensive. The majority of parents did not give a hoot one way or the other.

The real power in Scottish education is the Inspectorate. They exercise real power and influence. The Consultative Committee on the Curriculum is supposed to initiate change. Most of its publications gather dust on the shelf, and have little impact. Nevertheless, Her Majesty's Inspectors and Advisers, the Director's field officers, soon began to push a certain line across the land, and if you did not go at least some of the way with them you ran the risk of not being promoted. It's a very close system in Scotland, and word soon gets around. Change always comes from the top down - Scottish Education Department - Directorate/Her Majesty's Inspectors/Advisers-headteacher- principal

teachers. This makes teachers cynical, as they see themselves as having to put someone else's ideas into practice all the time.

Many subject teachers saw the opportunity to blaze a trail for their subject (and themselves in the process), and began to preach the comprehensive gospel. It was for them a case of either getting on the band-wagon or being crushed by it. A lot who climbed aboard were not totally convinced - only a small minority of people were genuinely enthusiastic for the comprehensive idea. The wiser heads chose not to lead the new campaign. Many people still had a pride in Scottish education and what it stood for. Many people got to high positions in life because of a good senior secondary education. Many people did not wish to see that tradition destroyed, for what appeared to be a political fad. Even now, I cannot honestly say that children leaving secondary 5 today have got as good an education as I myself got, for all the money and new ideas that have flooded the system.

A comprehensive school stands or falls by its location. If the circumstances are right - balanced social and ability intake - then fine. If the hoodlum, non-learning element is great in number, you have a disaster on your hands. The tone of a school is set by the size of the less able population. The power of the peer-group should not be underestimated. You must stream to protect the interest of the keen and able pupils who want to get on. Mixed-ability classes have a negative impact on these pupils, and lead to a loss of learning ethos in the school. All these new ideas - team-teaching, individualised learning, group methods - hold back the able. They may, I grant you, arouse pupils' interest, but what effect do they have on your Scottish Certificate of Education results in secondary 4 and secondary 5? These

methods are really gimmicks to tart up subjects so that they will be more attractive. But they reduce the emphasis on learning. I was out of sympathy with anything that appeared to be a frill. I am sure many teachers of the old academic disciplines held similar views. Comprehensive education is not educationally efficient, even though it is fairer to all sections of the community. To that extent the comprehensive idea was an alien one for Scottish teachers, who saw their task as primarily to sort children out according to ability. Scheme schools are glorified junior secondary schools. The label 'COMPREHENSIVE' allowed politicians to claim that they were following a 'comprehensive policy', but in fact it was a label which was used to cover a wide variety of different practices. Headteachers were trusted to run their own schools. Any pressure on them was always gentlemanly. Broad guidelines were given in circulars but the actual running of schools was our own business.

Geographical location could prevent a 'comprehensive' school from making a go of things, but without a doubt the major barrier to success was professional dissatisfaction and an unwillingness to embrace the changes comprehensive education entailed. Circular 600 was deeply resented; it simply steam-rollered government policy over an unwilling profession. The two-tier system was tolerated to start with, but eventually not allowed to continue, as it was seen to bestow a privileged status on some schools and not on others. I only abandoned ability grouping in the lower school very late, when I was forced to. Many people operated various internal arrangements under a variety of names; the main objective was not to harm the ablest pupils for any longer than was absolutely necessary. By the end of secondary 2 most pupils had been allocated to certificate or non-certificate courses, although some

schools allowed pupils to do a mixture.

I think there has been a shift in teacher methodology in recent years. Teachers had to change to survive. Many, I think, changed for this reason rather than because they were fully convinced that the change was for the better! Teachers' Centres and in-service courses played a big part in getting teachers talking, and creating an atmosphere where problems could be discussed. The structure of the curriculum hasn't changed much, but its content has undergone some modification. But the fact remained that comprehensive education was here to stay. It could not be ignored. So people had to adjust to the life they found in school. The old ways were no longer appropriate. However, because something is new, does not mean that it is necessarily good.

Comprehensive education suffered a good deal from being associated with the concept of equality of opportunity. This was a slogan which was loosely and carelessly used to convince everyone that all pupils were suddenly going to get Ordinary grades. No attention was given to the fact that many other factors affect success at school than merely being given the chance. This creates a bar to how much success you have in school, even assuming you have the chance.

The potential of the comprehensive school has not been realised - did it ever have any potential? It certainly has not produced the goods in terms of academic results. The present tide of public opinion is anti-comprehensive, with strong moves to privatisation and increased parental choice.

1. The moves to introduce comprehensive education came from politicians via parents who were concerned about existing selection procedures. There was a gradual dissatisfaction with a system which sent so many children to junior secondary school on the strength of dubious criteria. This was taken on by politicians and made an issue.
2. The initiatives were educational first, and political second. The politicians had educational interests at heart. I would also add that some educationists were concerned and uneasy. Some authorities and their selection boards had already increased the number of pupils admitted to senior secondary schools. So people were already trying to extend opportunities.
3. The 1947 Report had no influence with the majority of the Scottish teaching profession. Its influence has been much later, in the 1960s/1970s, when many people kept harking back to the ideas that it had promoted.
4. The 1960s was a time of full employment. Opportunity was the big thing. There was an awareness of the benefits of higher education (cf. Robbins), and this filtered down to secondary education. The idea was to make the most of what you had, and succeed through education, which came to be valued highly by parents and pupils alike.
5. Circular 600 brought a new idea: THE SAME OPPORTUNITIES FOR ALL

CHILDREN IN ONE SCHOOL. That was the major implication. Even so-called 'comprehensive' schools had rigid divisions within them. Knightswood Secondary was a good example. It had certificate and non-certificate syllabuses for each subject. The comprehensive school brought a new idea: different levels of teaching and different levels of ability. The emphasis was shifted from the syllabus/course to the pupil.

6. a) Her Majesty's Inspectors promoted comprehensive education. In fact, they were the prime movers.
 - b) Local politicians were not very active in my experience.
 - c) Directors, who were pointed in the right direction by Her Majesty's Inspectors gave the schools a gentle push along the comprehensive road. They selected innovative schools as showpieces or testbeds for new ideas.
 - d) Advisers tackled the comprehensive issue at the level of classroom realities.
 - e) The Consultative Committee on the Curriculum was influential but, in a quiet way.
7. The biggest obstacle to the introduction of comprehensive education was the inbuilt attitudes to teachers. Some refused to move on things like the common course and mixed-ability classes, which were quickly adopted as being synonymous with the comprehensive school. Both created enormous problems. Lack of adequate resources and old building did not help. Much was left to headteachers who were given only gentle directives by the

Directorate. They occasionally visited schools to discuss difficulties.

10. Very few parents objected to comprehensive schools, and indeed most welcomed them in areas I have worked in.
11. Area schools in new towns were an ideal place to get comprehensive education off to a good start. A lot depended on the quality a comprehensive school had in teaching staff and facilities.
12. Change/reform within schools happened quite radically, with streaming/setting giving way to mixed-ability groups. Maths and Modern Languages held very tenaciously to old practices. An explicit attempt was made to get schools to change their emphasis and practices. The move was to put a stop to classification so that all children, regardless of ability could get an opportunity to show what they could do.
13. In-service courses, coupled with syllabus changes were both very valuable in changing attitudes. People conversed, exchanged experiences of how to get old content applied in a new set of circumstances. People compared notes. A lot of people were exposed to the new philosophy through in-service courses, but it is difficult to estimate how far they went back to school and put the ideas into practice.
14. a) Many headteachers did not welcome the idea of comprehensive education. They had a lot of fears and reservations. Those in

junior secondary schools welcomed the uplift in status, while those in senior secondary felt that they had nothing to gain by the new order.

b) Teachers in purpose-built schools generally welcomed the idea but there was a general cynicism that the new system would not make a great deal of difference to the eventual outcome of the educational process.

15. The junior secondary/senior secondary divide survived for a long time, although it was officially unauthorised. It took a very long time for the system to catch up with the changeover to comprehensive education.

16. Secondary 1/2 - mixed-ability, except in Maths/Modern Languages.
Secondary 3/4 - the usual set-up was a certificate/non-certificate split.

Some schools had non-certificate pupils categorised as such across the board, and therefore open to very limited opportunities. The more adventurous schools had bridging courses - mixed Ordinary/non-certificate - to cater better for individual strengths and weaknesses.

17. The advent of the comprehensive school affected both curriculum and methods. A gradual awareness arose that the textbook was on the way out. Ideas like group methods, worksheets, workcards, modular courses, alternative syllabuses gained some recognition.

18. Teachers have gradually become more objective, and have grown less inclined to assume that they know what they are about, and

that there is a need to search for appropriate content and method. There was a gradual realisation that former approaches had shortcomings. The comprehensive school acted as a catalyst to criticise existing practice, and search for something better.

19. Scottish education has traditionally been associated with opportunities and making the most of them. Omnibus schools encouraged pupils to go on if the family approved. (The real economic plight of many families made the lad o' pairts as much of a myth as a reality.) The comprehensive school got back to old ideas - making opportunities available to all, rather than some, so that they could develop their potential.
20. Equality of opportunity was seen by teachers as no holds barred to educational success for any pupils who had the ability. The restrictive selection practices gave way to a looser system, where pupils were encouraged to pick up what they wanted. But it is not unfair to say that the academic quality of the senior secondary school was higher than in the junior secondary school. The comprehensive secondary opened up access to good academic teaching to those pupils who could benefit, but who formerly would have been denied this.
21. A comprehensive school is one which is totally open to the community. Its aim is to enable every child make the most of whatever ability he has. It should also make available a whole range of curricular and extra-curricular pursuits. It should extend experience, and develop interests. Guidance and social education provision should cater for the whole person.

22. There has been undoubted progress, e.g. the number of academic presentations. But it has been accompanied by a decline in academic standards. Realism leads one to expect this. The ideal teaching situation is 1:1; the further you extend the range of ability, and further you move from that ideal, and the more diverse will be the outcome, and the further you will move from academic excellence. Broadening the ability range affects standards, and you end up not stretching the ablest. The middle range children and poorer kids get a better deal in a comprehensive school, so I suppose each intake as a whole does well. The unsolved problem is that very able children, because they are not stretched, develop early attitudes which affect their later work and performance. The comprehensive school has caused the very able to suffer slightly at the expense of the others.

1. The initiatives for comprehensive education were definitely political rather than educational. People who were advocating it strongly had not gone fully into its implications or thought about its end product - certification and a curriculum tailored to the needs of all. A small number of people in education wanted change, but the real impetus came from the politicians who, having got hold of what they thought was a good idea, pushed it without giving it serious thought.
3. The 1947 Report had influence in a restricted field only. It contained much that was sound. The official implementation of comprehensive education in Scotland was not what was argued for in the Report, but in reality what actually happened was in line with its thinking.
4. There was disquiet about the appalling staffing shortage which affected junior secondary schools, in particular, and made many of them abominable places. I do not think that there was disquiet about the control exam, as a fairly high percentage of pupils got into senior secondary schools as compared with the situation in England. It was obvious to anyone with any sense that as a test it only measured one ability, and took no account of other factors. If there was any disquiet, it was on social grounds. There was a feeling of stigma attached to the junior secondary school. In ---- there was most definitely a hierarchy of schools - the Academy (formerly fee-paying), the High, and then the two junior secondaries. The cut-off points really were

unfair: those at the bottom of the senior secondary school were condemned by comparison to their abler peers and also, of course, denuded the junior secondary schools of some better pupils. In -----, too, there were schools which 'had a name' - the grammar school and ---- High. Many senior secondary schools were socially comprehensive but educationally selective.

5. The main implication of Circular 600 for authorities in the densely populated urban areas was merging junior secondary and senior secondary schools. Buildings were an awful problem. The schools were in the wrong places. For example, the east end of ----- had no school. Then came all the problems over zoning and catchment areas.
6. a) I don't think Her Majesty's Inspectors had much influence. They carried out what the civil servants wanted them to do. They were given the job of translating political arguments into educational reality in schools. They helped headteachers and their staffs to cope with the mess caused by the fact that the changeover to comprehensive education was mismanaged in the extreme. They had some fancy ideas but little conception of what it is like to run a school.
- b) Local politicians had no effect whatever on what happened in schools.
- c) The Directorate was far-sighted in Renfrewshire. The Director himself was able to influence and control things as long as he stayed within his powers. His manner was persuasive, and people mostly thought what he suggested was essential or desirable. He

got on well with the Committee, which did not have a strong political group dominating it. The Director was a respected figure who controlled by force of argument.

- d) Advisers had no influence to start with. I was happy with the majority. They were helpful with promoted posts, supplies and requisitions. Some were useless, lazy sods.
- e) The Consultative Committee on the Curriculum was a reactive body, and as such did not do much to advance the cause of comprehensive education. It did not lead, but published papers which contained all the things you would have expected.

7. The major problem was that comprehensive education was introduced at a time of acute staff shortage. Some subjects, in particular, were badly hit, and there were many uncertificated teachers. Buildings and facilities also caused problems.

9. You only ever got guidelines as a headteacher, never directives. The attitude was very much: WE HAVE APPOINTED YOU HEADTEACHER SO GET ON WITH IT. The Director would discuss problems or difficulties with you, but you were very much on your own. As long as you could justify what you did in your school if anyone asked you, you were OK.

10. There was no public stir or outcry among parents in Scotland. Only parents in posh places like ----- caused a fuss, because they did not want their children to associate with ordinary working class kids..

11. Area schools in housing estates were specifically a city problem unknown in country areas. They did not cause a major problem, but if a school gets a bad name, whether justified or not, there's not a lot you can do about it.
- Private schools were so few and far between that they had no effect whatever.
12. Comprehensive schools had to have an effect. What generally happened was that children were quickly divided into certificate and non-certificate groups, but there was always the opportunity to move them up or down at a later stage. Various methods of internal grouping were used, but in the end it came to the same thing. As I said earlier, you were allowed to do as you liked as long as you could justify it. Most people were able to put up a cogent defence for what arrangements they adopted.
13. I do not think that comprehensive education itself had much effect, but raising of the school leaving age did. It caused the equivalent of an explosion of in-service courses and material writing. A lot of the material was useless, but at least it was there to be used and tested, so that teachers were not left high and dry. In general, in-service courses only spread as the full implications of comprehensive education began to be appreciated. For comprehensive education itself there was absolutely no preparation; the change was imposed.
14. a) Heads split into three identifiable groups: a very small minority who were enthusiastic about it, some who were indifferent and the majority who hated the whole notion.

b) Among teachers there was less indifference as most were against it. Much depended on the school you were in. Some staff were at a loss with less able children. The prevailing tradition was academic with the highest qualified teachers taking all the best classes.

15. Basically, children were grouped by ability. Any with promise
+
16. got a chance. Doing away with Verbal Reasoning Quotient left secondary schools with no objective assessment on which to group children. At least the old system was a measure, albeit rough. Also, primary estimates were uneven in quality and accuracy.

17. a) The curriculum was affected but only gradually. As I said before, comprehensive education was introduced with no end product in sight. What happened was that ever-increasing numbers of children were squeezed into an academic curriculum that ill-suited them. This left a residue without a hope in hell of passing any exam. Much hard work was put into the so-called craft certificates, but Strathclyde Regional Council would not allow schools to go for Certificate of Secondary Education - a decision which was the very antithesis of what it preached. Munn and Dunning was the wrong thing at the wrong time. Many of us fought for years for the less academically able children but the Scottish Education Department and Strathclyde Regional Council just did not want to know. Munn and Dunning was a rushed, botched-up amateurish job, which brought a decrease in curriculum choice and disgraceful assessment proposals. The whole thing was introduced in the wrong way. It was badly handled, as most things are in Scottish education. A massive change was again

imposed with minimal discussion time. It was certainly not regarded as the Messiah for all the ills besetting secondary schools.

b) Methods really received an impetus when mixed-ability classes were 'in'. The secondary 1/2 Report caused a ripple of change. Methods, of course, depend on individual teachers, but a lot depends on the ethos created in schools and/or subject departments, so that headteachers and principal teachers assume a very important role.

18. Teachers had to adapt their approaches to survive, and the bulk did, but only minimally. Much depended on their background, and for those in senior secondary schools it was damned difficult. I would say that approaches were softened but not altered. You must always remember, in fairness, that teachers were under tremendous pressure from large classes, and people like Her Majesty's Inspectors whose lofty expectations of what could be done often exceeded the harsh realities of everyday life in a school. The curriculum in any school is dictated by the staff a school has, not by the Scottish Education Department. So, there was no outright thwarting of developments, and any 'mistakes' were made in good faith.
19. The arrival of comprehensive education was a shock, but it never became a radical change in Scotland. It caused hardly any change in rural areas. Most of the problems arose in cities. A lot depended on where you were: Bearsden is not Drumchapel. The main problem was coping with neds that teachers had never seen

the like of before.

20. The theory was that children should have every opportunity to develop their full potential, whatever that happened to be. But the paradox was that comprehensive schools were born in an age when technological change, and other pressures meant that, in reality, 'opportunity' meant opportunity to get a good job. So opportunity was taken to mean the road to a successful life, which could only be taken after passing Scottish Certificate of Education examinations. So, in theory, the idea was great but, given the role expected of schools, it had no chance of success.
21. Any comprehensive school must have a balanced intake educationally and socially. It just doesn't work if either of these elements is heavily skewed. Much depends on the strengths and weaknesses of the staff and the philosophy of the headteacher.
22. An emphatic no. Much depends on a school's location, the attitude of the staff, and the political and economic climate of the country.

1. I suppose comprehensive initiatives could be traced back as far as Knox - education for all irrespective of social background - but it didn't really become a major issue till the 20th century, beginning in the 1920s and slowly working up to a climax in the late 50s and 60s. Educational theorists and sociologists did good work in putting the educational arguments in the public eye, and gradually in Scotland there grew up the feeling that we ought to do in the urban village what we had been doing in omnibus schools for years in the more rural areas. The source of the initiative was political, chiefly from the Labour Party.
2. The two strands are intertwined, and I'd find it difficult to place the adverb 'primarily'. I suppose it all really started from the educational arguments put forward by Tawney and social policy statements from Marshall and other academics. But these couldn't be sustained, so the political overtones gained prominence. These coincided with a rising groundswell of opinion against selection in education, and all sorts of wonderful theories of a new society began to appear. Political intervention in what had started out as an educational argument caused positions to become polarised, the educational arguments got swamped, and the political response dominated. The good solid educational arguments did not prove too practicable, which meant that comprehensive education did not work for about the first decade of its existence. The educational case became lost in the arguments of those who had taken up a position from which they argued that education could help to create a more equal

society. The comprehensive movement tried to achieve the impossible on a misplaced political ticket.

3. It lay dormant for a good number of years after its publication in 1947. When the comprehensive movement was a few years old people harked back to it. It was held up as a classic, a document which could provide authoritative backing for, or evidence to support the comprehensive cause. But it appeared at a level in the educational world well above that of staffroom discussion. On the whole, most teachers do not read educational reports. So the Report was used selectively by comprehensive protagonists to bolster their case.
4. It was a period of enormous hopes, the era of plenty. People had got over the war weariness of 1945. Prosperity gradually came - 'you've never had it so good' etc. Accompanying this increase in the material standard of living, there was a growing feeling that society had to be more equal, and that the place to launch the equality drive was in schools, which rapidly became seen as places to achieve social and political objectives. I take the view that schools are not leaders and moulders as much as reflectors or society's moves, but in the 1960s the predominant view was that they could be very influential in shaping the new society. A lot of people were dragged into the educational system who never believed it to be the important vehicle for change that those with aspiring middle class values did. Schools became seen as the key distributor of the benefits of education and, through it, status in society. Schools were seen as being weapons against both inequality and injustice. These two things

are separate, and I think that schools can do something to tackle the latter, but nothing about the former. Remember, of course, that the bulk of teachers do not operate on a conceptual level at which they analyse the role of the school in society. They come to school to teach from 9-4. So I doubt very much if we got true comprehensive education after Circular 600. There was a complacent assumption that, given the political statement, it would all just fall into place. Some politicians are liars and hypocrites: as long as the name 'comprehensive' was used to describe the system, they couldn't have cared less about the realities of the situation. A political pronouncement does not necessarily bring about change in the fine operation of an educational system, especially one with centuries of tradition behind it. Comprehensive education, in my view, never got a chance. No one thought of learning from countries like Sweden, who had been in that system for a decade. There was a naivety and amateurishness about the way the whole thing was broached.

5. The single most important implication, apart from material and economic issues, was how teachers were going to cater for the spectrum of ability. I think that, in the best junior secondary schools, pupils achieved positive if limited goals, because they were tackling courses devised for them with meaning and relevance. The target audience was clear. In the confusion and bewilderment that greeted the early years of comprehensive education, I am less sure about the deal the average and less able pupils got. My feeling is that it was not good in general.

6. 1) Her Majesty's Inspectors are always important in the Scottish

system, and tend to be respected as a highly able and knowledgeable group of people. They must have had a very difficult time from 1965 onwards, given their own elitist background. Most had come through and/or taught in the former selective system, and this experience must have coloured their outlook. I do not think that their motivation can have been particularly high. Of course, there were probably exceptions but most of them did a good promotion job, producing the goods to suit the political needs of the time.

- 2) They reflected the national party lines, and acted as ginger groups to keep the comprehensive issue alive, especially in areas where they encountered resistance.
- 3) To start with, advisers did not play the creative role that they do now. The advisory service was an early response to the complexities of comprehensive education at a time when resources were plentiful. They turned out to be an additional layer of educational administration which was criticised by many people. Their function was to identify creative activity in their subjects, co-ordinate and disseminate it. Because they were outsiders, it was easier for them to go into other schools.
- 4) They are curious people who play some very odd games. I often wonder what you would find if you scratched the surface of an education official. It is not easy to know what they are thinking, or where they want the system to move. Of course, they have educational views. In 1965, most Directorate staff gain were elitist rather than comprehensively minded, as a result of upbringing and experience. In the main, they made administrative rather than educational responses to the political thrusts to

which they were subjected.

- 5) The Consultative Committee on the Curriculum has never been accorded the importance its publications have merited. These have been collectively rather than individually influential, each one being part of a linear production line of curriculum development. The effect of the Consultative Committee on the Curriculum's work has been subtle and pervasive over the period of its existence, rather than dramatic or revolutionary.

7. The main obstacles to the introduction of comprehensive education were:

- an educational system steeped in the elitist tradition
- the innate conservatism of all layers of the education service in Scotland
- a lack of intellectualism in senior people. They talk in woolly terms, with no power of analysis
- the poor, ad-hoc organisational response to Circular 600. People hadn't a clue how to go about it, so reactions were individual rather than part of a coherent, overall national strategy for comprehensive education
- there was confusion even among proponents as to what comprehensive education was or was supposed to be. Nobody sat down and worked out a plan
- also, it was approached the wrong way - viz through buildings and staffing. There was no thought of examining the teaching and learning approaches and implications of these. A fundamentally restrictive view obtained: 'the pupils are all in the one building so we have a comprehensive system'.

Educational questions got lost in administrative preoccupations

- there were massive problems in cities like Glasgow, with large post-war housing estates, and thus catchment areas drowned in a working class ethos. This is not a criticism, but a statement of fact. A lot of families moved to 'better' areas when I taught in ----, especially those with hopes for their children. So, in places like that, comprehensive education hardly got off to a flying start.

8. Implementation of policy is the characteristic filtering down mechanism in Scottish education from the mandarins in the Scottish Office through Directors to headteachers. Such a system where responsibility is devolved depends on the enthusiasm for a particular policy at each link in the chain.
9. In matters of national policy there are fairly tight prescriptions but as far as the internal organisation of your own school is concerned, the freedom is, and certainly was then, virtually total. When I went to --- in 1971, the school was arranged in the classic omnibus pattern - certificate pupils, non-certificate pupils and remedial pupils, called the 'mods' - all quite separate courses. So, you see, some headteachers quite obviously held back on comprehensive developments as a result of their own educational philosophy. Thus it must be open to question how far the system was moved on comprehensive lines after 1965. There certainly was not a move on a broad front.
10. I honestly cannot remember. Parental responses to educational

initiatives tend to be confused and indistinct. I do not think the bulk of parents were affected one way or the other. Those with an aspiring middle class outlook were quite obviously not pleased, as they perceived comprehensive education as a watered-down academic one, and thus a drop in standard. Individual parents are understandably primarily concerned about their kids, not about wider educational or philosophical arguments. I think that in the event, comprehensive education meant more of the same but worse. The dreadful staff shortages in the 60s and early 70s and teacher reluctance to move militated against a proper launch of the new system.

13. There was not a great deal of internal change in the way schools were run. Mixed-ability classes and the common course were concepts which appeared much later, when the full implications of the comprehensive philosophy began to be felt. They were put forward as ways of coping with the spread of ability.
14. They unquestionably played a part, but my impression of participating in panel and committee meetings was that it was reminiscent of going to church - only the converts attended. So I would say that given its voluntary aspect, in-service courses helped those that went to them, while those who did not were suspicious of their motives for being there.
15. The answer to any question on these schools depends on one's view of society. If you think they have a major effect then you hold a different view of society from someone who thinks they are so small in number as to be ineffectual. I tend to the view that

their effects are imperceptible on the state system. Some pathetic arguments were dredged up to bolster political causes in the debacle over the fee-paying corporation schools in Glasgow in the early 70s. For some people who are pro-comprehensive, it is at least logical to say that a comprehensive system is incompatible with any form of private or selective education.

16. They were - and are - an innately conservative group of people, who greeted the shift to a comprehensive system with disbelief, distrust or scepticism. There were a few real enthusiasts who were really convinced and welcomed the development, but in the main most heads were not wildly delighted at the prospect.
17. It changed the previous pattern in structural terms. Heads and their staffs had no experience of, or training for a comprehensive approach, so it is not surprising that they fell back on what they knew best, and relied on that, in the absence of guidance or help on an organised basis from the authorities. People were not educated to work in the new ways. Comprehensive education was a real innovation, but was not treated as such.
18. There should be classes of mixed-ability for as long as children do not suffer. Much depends on the subject. At all events, children should not be labelled in groups; it's individuals that matter. You cannot be dictatorial in this matter. There's no best way. What is more important is the quality of the service pupils are getting. This is where the importance of management style comes in. Compromise may be essential for the sake of the children's education.

19. It had an enormous but very gradual effect on both curriculum and methods in general, particularly in secondary 1/2. There was a lot of good thinking done in most subjects by those who responded positively and professionally to the challenge. Content became more varied and less cerebral, and there were some moves away from whole class teaching. Some teachers either could not or would not conceive of such a departure from the traditional chalk and talk approach. In a sense, Standard grade courses are the logical outcome of the effects of comprehensive education on both curriculum and methods.
20. There was no natural scrutiny of ideas. Rather, the forces of circumstance drove people to do things differently without necessarily altering their ideological base. Philosophically, the bulk of teachers were never keen on the idea of the comprehensive school, but they had to survive every day, so they shifted a bit.
21. It articulated to some degree with the parish school concept and the lad o' pairts idea. Remember, of course, that it was a case of to hell with any lad who didn't have the pairts! I think, therefore, that the move to comprehensive education was seen by many as making available to all what the lad o' pairts had traditionally enjoyed - the opportunity of going places through education, the chance of an academic education. As such, and seen in those terms, comprehensive education was entirely acceptable to the Scottish national consciousness. Some devious but simple-minded people tried to push it on egalitarian arguments that all can be equal. This was a non-starter.

22. a) Again the lad o' pairts sums up the Scottish view of equality of opportunity nearly - let nothing stand in the way of the success of the able.
- b) Yes, that view existed and still exists. It's very much a case of look after number one, but such obvious lack of faith in the state comprehensive must affect credibility in the eyes of the general public.
- c) The best claims of a comprehensive school are the best claims of any school - to do the best it can for all its pupils whatever their ability. The theoretical social benefits claimed for comprehensive education have not materialised, and in some places cannot. But any new system has to be made to work, not just allowed to develop and all parties involved must play their part, especially the politicians, who in my view have progressively killed off the opportunities which were inherent in the comprehensive principle. They, who started the ball rolling, turned their back on their creation and chose not to examine it too closely to see if it was working out as they had thought.
24. No, because politicians have too readily accepted the status quo, not enough money was made continuously available, and the poor classroom teacher had to bear the brunt of it all. Also, there were not enough people in the profession with a vision of what society could be in terms of caring and sharing and community, and what education's contribution could be. There was not enough accountability in the system, and even when the term began to be used seriously, it was defined narrowly in terms of exam passes. Basically, in the world of Scottish education, simplistic views

predominate at all levels, and thus people do not ask fundamental questions.

1. The belief that if children were educated together they would integrate socially.
2. Political motives were paramount.
3. The 1947 Report was an inspiring document, inspiring fear in the traditional High Schools. Scottish Secondary Teachers' Association voted against report, led by Dr Dewar (Heriot's). Sir James Robertson was saddened by the extreme element of Scottish Secondary Teachers' Association resistance.
4. Time of industrial expansion and extensive school building. Comprehensive education suits the backdrop and is convenient in every aspect of school - except teaching.
5. Her Majesty's Inspectors were simply instructed by the Scottish Office (Lord Ross and Judith Hart). Education officials continued their function of the qualified ventriloquist speaking for the elected members. Educational areas were split.
6. The Educational Institute of Scotland was quietly manoeuvred into comprehensivism by a Glasgow fraction. Scottish MPs (whom teachers met in House of Commons) were mild and hoped for a dual system.
7. Delaying tactics were adopted by regions. They submitted plans, then more plans. Her Majesty's Inspectors found themselves in an

unusually embarrassing position, doing what they felt was wrong.

8. The Scottish Education Department and Secretary of State directed policy declarations. Local Government often voted against comprehensivism but to no avail. Their plans were thrown out by the Scottish Education Department.
9. Headteachers were called to heel (e.g. Glasgow High). Meetings were held with Director of Education saying 'get on with it'.
10. Local pressure groups were formed in towns to preserve the old High Schools. They were sincere but often ill-informed and futile.
11. Too much latitude for organisation of comprehensive schools resulted sometimes in chaotic situations, disciplinary trouble and academic decline.
12. Change in school organisation, both primary and secondary, was calamitous, where a pattern was violently imposed. The sensible course was to 'work in' the new system as pupils were recruited into 1st year secondary.
13. Teachers' Centres and in-service training were not, to my mind, helpful. The experience was not there and guest speakers - enthusiasts from South of the Border - aroused criticism rather than inspiration.
14. Headteachers reacted in three ways:

- 1) violent opposition: e.g. public declarations of opposition published in newspapers
- 2) worked out old system, with confidence and introduced new system with many misgivings
- 3) both had to placate parental attitudes as the parental public experienced the social consequences of the New World.

15. The best of the junior secondaries rose well to the challenge but had staffing problems. Well handled, the top layers of the junior secondary assumed a technical grammar school air. This demonstrated that the Technical Grammar School was a neglected opportunity.
16. Common courses for 1 and 2 were the order of the day: a fatuous process neglecting the able or sinking the less able. Data available were five point grading, A B C D E and two IQs. Mixed-ability classes showed particular problems in Maths and foreign languages.
17. Yes: One had to contract the senior curriculum to compensate for wasted time in secondary 1 and 2.
18. The curricular reform had to be reorganised or restricted in the areas of mixed-ability grouping. French teaching and Maths had difficulty in holding class groups together, because of ability range. Teachers used the group method at primary school.
19. Two approaches:
 1. for the senior secondary turning comprehensive

2. for the junior secondary expanding to comprehensive
Social difficulties in speech, attitudes, customs, games etc.
The expanding junior secondary had the edge in pupil attitude as
it expanded and enriched its time-table.

20. Very largely a social matter. The Scots are unwilling to believe
in a false concept of equality.

21. a) A secondary school offering courses across the ability range.
Social training, community involvement should be clear-cut and
vigorously upheld.

b) Bricks, mortar, buildings, time-tables.

22. Not at all. NB in 5th and 6th forms where we should develop
community leaders, special talents and community relations.

1. The impetus was purely political. It was a vote-catcher because it suited the mood of the electorate at that time. Saying this is in no way to belittle the sincere and genuine feelings of many people who supported the comprehensive school. In my view it was primarily an experiment in social engineering. There was no conception whatever of the educational implications for schools. Egalitarian feelings were in vogue, but the development was rather halting in Scotland, which is characterised in educational matters by a sort of pragmatic improvisation and ad hoc outlook. An important point against which to set the clamour for fairness and justice which occurred in the post-war years is that the Scottish educational system is traditionally extremely elitist and authoritarian in its operation. There were practical reasons also which contributed to the evolution towards a comprehensive system: the rocketing birthrate, the booming economy and an increasingly materialistic outlook on the world which wanted to grab hold of every opportunity possible. At this time, too, a lot of working class children, for whom parents had made a sacrifice, were now coming into teaching and other important positions in education. So there was bound to be a general sympathy in Scotland to the proposal to adopt a comprehensive system of education. Nevertheless, and very obviously, the actual changeover was a messy business. It was all rather amorphous and inchoate, lacking in an overall plan.
2. At the time, the motives were purely political. It happened at a

time when many people thought that the educational system was working perfectly well: there was the private sector for the sons and daughter of the rich, and the state system which took the brightest and educated them very soundly in senior secondary schools, and catered for their less able brothers and sisters in junior secondaries. It is also true, however, that some of the latter were dreadful, especially in the big cities.

3. The 1947 Report was eventually influential. It became the golden book of the golden age of Scottish education. It set forth simple basic issues, but in a very sentimental manner. Because of the elegant prose in which it was couched, it won a 'succès d'estime'. But it took four years for the Scottish Education Department to issue a Circular, and even then some of the proposals which have since come to pass were rejected. Scottish Education Department officials are not noted for being adventurous. It was claimed that the means were not there to implement its recommendations. Funds can always be found if it's a priority. What the Report did do was set a principle - a *modus operandi* if you like for investigating educational matters, namely the working party with a large practitioner representation. In that sense, the Advisory Council was a precursor of the Consultative Committee on the Curriculum and its plethora of working parties. But its philosophical defence of and plea for the comprehensive school did not influence many people.

4. There occur certain modal points in human affairs in which decisions of the heart are in tune with the prevailing spirit of

the times. Comprehensive education was pushed when the chances were great that it would be accepted by the public. It was said by a politician at the time that the social benefits of the comprehensive school would be considerable, any educational benefits a bonus. There was a realisation that something was unfair or even wrong with an educational system which wrote off such a high proportion of children at the end of their primary schooling. The comprehensive school was the great white hope, the new creation which would solve all the problems of the educational world and of society. But there was no research done, no evaluation of how it would work. No serious questions were asked. Very few people were consulted. It was a case of 'just do it'. There was a wide expectation that people in Scottish schools would make it work somehow.

5. Education Committees, in general, know very little of the workings of the education system about which they take such important decisions. As a result, at times of major change, the standing, knowledge and energy of the Director of Education assume added importance. In --- the Director took a serious view of the Circular and set about implementing it honestly. But in such a rural area, there was a widely-held feeling that schools had already been run on comprehensive lines for years, so there was less of a feeling of innovation. A two tier system continued in ---- for a long time because of sparseness of population and the economic difficulties of funding a massive building programme.

6. 1) They played a strong and active role, nobbling Directors and

heads and running in-service courses, at which they talked at participants about the implications of the Department's Circular. They did a promotion job for the Scottish Education Department officials, but it wasn't very effective as they tended to be authoritarian figures of whom teachers were scared, or at least apprehensive.

- 2) They had no influence whatever in schools, possibly more in the Education Committees on which they served. A lot depends with an elected member the extent of his personal knowledge of the issue at stake. At the very least, most would be aware of the term 'comprehensive school' because it was an election issue.
- 3) Advisers were pretty useless in the main. They were camp followers who became absorbed in administrative and organisational matters. They depended for their livelihood on support from the Directorate and heads/principal teachers.
- 4) I am not entirely sure how genuinely popular the idea of comprehensive schools was with Directorate staff. I think most of them would leave their personal feelings to one side and do a professional job in getting the message across and dealing with its implications in their own areas.
- 6) The creation of the Consultative Committee on the Curriculum was an act of foresight. It was an attempt to create an organised approach to investigating curricular matters, and promoting solutions to curricular problems to all schools. It was to my mind a good idea, and was less tentative and had more influence than the Advisory Council.

7. The main obstacles to the introduction of comprehensive education were:
- the speed and shameful rush with which the whole thing was introduced. There was a feeling of 'too much too fast'
 - no research was done, before or after to monitor progress
 - the inadequacy of some school buildings
 - staff shortage and unpreparedness
 - the Scottish self-satisfaction with its education system. Because of the philosophical tradition, we tend to be good at theory, but not in the practice
 - the general resistance to change in education, exacerbated in the case of comprehensive schools, which were seen as an outside imposition, with staff left to cope with the details of the implications. No one had a clue about how to go about devising appropriate curricula or assessment procedures to match.
8. Headteachers and their staffs in the main. A lot buckled to and did a fairly honest job in trying to make it all work. But responses tended to be individual. Education officials didn't know what to do either, so they were groping for suggestions. That's why there were a lot of courses and seminars arranged.
9. Heads had far too much latitude, unfortunately, for the launch of comprehensive schools. It was left entirely to heads to work out the detailed application of Circular 600 for their school. Guidelines were made up as we progressed, not before we started. There was no hint of the imposition of an overall strategy or pattern for the county. I gather it was the same in other parts

of the country. Everyone had their own interpretation.

10. There is a long tradition in Scotland of not consulting parents about anything. Some don't give a hoot about what's happening in schools, but ambitious, usually middle class parents are concerned. The main worries voiced over comprehensivisation were: the effect of a large influx of less able children on the clever ones; undesirable social mixing; the effect of the new system on future Ordinary and Higher prospects. But parents didn't need to worry; the customary division into ability groups, characteristic of the omnibus school, took place. Social class feelings are very strong in Scotland - in --- the division was fisher people and the others. In general, parents were told about developments by the schools themselves.
11. The hitherto inexperienced wide ability range, and its affect on administrative and organisational habits. Later people began to examine the implications on the curriculum. The principal teachers, the guy ropes of any school structure, were the people most involved here.
12. Yes, catchment areas allied to geographical location meant that in ---, junior secondary schools continued in existence till 1970, more and more of them presenting their best pupils for Scottish Certificate of Education Ordinary grade.
13. Changes which occurred were in the main confined to secondary 1/2. Secondary 3/4 classes tended to be arranged as certificate or non-certificate groups. Some --- schools did experiment with the English Certificate of Secondary Education Mode 3 exam.

14. ---- College of Education embarked on a considerable programme of in-service courses for teachers. Most were concerned with curriculum matters or new exam syllabuses. A lot depended on the quality of the teaching which, in my view, was variable.
15. There was not a pronounced 'anti' feeling towards such schools up here as they took such a small proportion of children. The vast majority of children attended state schools.
16. Younger heads in general were enthusiastic or at least willing to give comprehensive education a fair go. Older ones were in various groups: those against, those afraid, those mixed-up. In ---, education is still very highly regarded. That part of the country has a long tradition of providing sound education and is fiercely proud of it. As a result, it is a rarified business: to be able and successful still gives a great deal of local cachet, and feeds local feelings of snobbishness. If you are thick, you might as well look for a plot in the graveyard, socially at any rate. Some teachers up there had only ever taught certificate sections from third year onwards. Those were the Honours Graduates'. Ordinary graduates were given secondary 1/2 classes or the less able. You can imagine, therefore, that any changeover in attitude or approach which took place was hardly dramatic or immediate. Principal teachers of established academic subjects in particular were quite happy to stay at that position and preserve their ideas in amber. In general, people sympathised with the comprehensive system in principle: they were less keen about what it implied in practice, especially because they had to do all the thinking. A lot of conscientious teachers

are quite happy to be told by their bosses exactly what to do, and they will do good solid job. Since comprehensive education was new for everyone, this did not happen, and many teachers were thrown off balance.

17. The two populations still remained separated for a long time, and the split appeared to worry teachers more than it did Directorate staff. The honest experiments that went on in most subject areas to devise suitable non-certificate courses were legion. In my opinion, such divisions are so powerful and deep-seated that violent political change is required to have any effect on the system. The introduction of Ordinary grade and the Munn and Dunning development programme I would put into this category, but not the introduction of comprehensive education. Circular 600 undoubtedly political, but it was not violent. Old practices continued in a complacent way, after we were supposed to be running comprehensive schools. All it did was increase the number of pupils presented for national exams. After counties had had their plans for comprehensive education approved by the Secretary of State, no one asked too many questions about what was happening inside the schools. Circular 600 was issued but not imposed. For all that, Her Majesty's Inspectors are said to be the links between the school system and the Scottish Office; my impression has always been either that it does not know or that it does not much care about what is happening in schools. Having said that, it has to be admitted that Circular 600 did set in motion a series of events from which there could be no turning back. Even after the Tories were returned in 1970, no authority rescinded its comprehensive scheme, at least to my knowledge.

But the degree to which real comprehensive education was implemented varied enormously.

18. This answer depends on the views of the headteacher about education in general and about Scottish Certificate of Education presentation in particular. I would say that some form of grouping should take place no later than the start of secondary 3. Some criteria for selection in the past were incredibly silly. As long as you retain a large measure of flexibility after initial allocation, things should be all right. Given the pull of Scottish Certificate of Education exams, I don't see how some sort of differentiation can be avoided.
19. There was a fair amount of change on the curriculum - content, exam syllabus etc, given that the new system had to happen. It's like throwing a people into a pool and seeing the ripple effect. I am not so sure that there was much change in teaching methods, despite all the advice that was heard at in-service courses on the subject. Teachers in general are not very adventurous or keen to experiment in this regard. Some good work was done for remedial children.
20. A few willingly looked at their work critically, most were very unwilling to do so. Do not underestimate the widespread feeling among teachers that the comprehensive system had been forced on them without consultation and without their blessing. A large number of teachers who made changes, therefore, did so because they felt forced to do so by the changed circumstance.

21. Scottish education, as you know, is wrapped up in its own mythology, and is taken very seriously and still regarded with pride. We have always been good at coming up with big ideas about education and setting them down in a grand, almost philosophical way. To that extent, Circular 600 fitted in with national tradition - do the best for all, banish any unfairness from the system. In reality, the single most important cause of our educational troubles in Scotland is our apparently incurable tendency to be highly elitist and academic in our approach to pupils and their abilities.
22. Equality of opportunity in Scotland was only ever for the able child who could clear the intellectual hurdles necessary to pass exams. The rest did not matter a damn. There is a traditional acceptance that the able must get a chance and never be held back for any reason. It did not matter so much when there was full employment for the hewers of wood and drawers of water. Scottish Certificate of Education Higher grade passes followed by a University degree was the pinnacle of educational achievement, and all the resources and the best teachers were saved for pupils who could reach that summit. That's the traditional fount of all our problems.
23. A comprehensive school is one of optimally 1,000 pupils which is characterised by an open-mindedness towards them all. Although it is a trite axiom, the school should educate them all according to the 3 A's, should make available to them all all the opportunities the school has to offer. Education has to be conceived of more broadly than passing exams, just as ability has

to be seen as more than answering essay questions. It should also be available as a resource to all members of the community it serves. The problem with the term 'comprehensive' is that it has not been satisfactorily defined: nobody knows what 'comprehensive'. The whole organisation should serve the needs of its customers.

24. No, the potential has not been tapped at all. Given traditional Scottish attitudes, we are still in 1985 arriving at a view of what a comprehensive school is, and what comprehensive education means. We are still at the stage of experimentation. All we have done is tinkered with the old set up and tried to make it fit. It is essential that preconceived ideas about the curriculum and assessment must be banished. It is wise to remember that educational aims or arguments produced by working parties in their reports are rarely accepted in their first form; they are soon tempered by the cold financial realism of the Scottish Office economists, whose prime concern is: HOW MUCH WILL THIS PROPOSAL COST? Change in education, given its political nature, is governed by the art of the possible.

You must remember that comprehensive education was only a burning issue for a few years, then it was accepted. It hardly affected some schools in the East of Scotland.

1. The source of initiatives to introduce comprehensive schools was essentially political, stemming from old-fashioned socialism and post-war optimism. It was a broader vision of Knox's idea of a school in every parish, and was intended to spread a more egalitarian climate of opinion into cities, since Scotland had many rural Academies. ----- Academy, for example, has been comprehensive for centuries.
2. The moves to introduce comprehensive education were basically political, but the knowledge of how to do it already existed in the country districts. City school staffs were afraid, and selective schools were naturally against it, because it brought harder work and more difficult pupils. This lost them esteem, being found out as inadequate teachers and disciplinarians.
3. In my career the 1947 Report was hardly heard of. It was as sincere as it was idealistic, but had no major impact.
4. The comprehensive school was really the educational expression of post-war, Beveridge type philosophy, in response to growing numbers and university expansion. It was much more acceptable in Scotland than in England.

5. The main implications of Circular C600 was wide-ability rather than selected intakes. Old selective schools changed in character, the extent of the change depending on the nature of the catchment area. In my opinion, little attempt was made to balance catchment areas and intakes. No one had the nerve to bus pupils.
6. a) The influence of Her Majesty's Inspectors has gradually declined.
- b) Local politicians were not a force to be reckoned with. Their view of comprehensive education would be coloured by their politics.
- c) Directors saw it through as part of their job in managing the service, just like appointing janitors.
- d) Advisers were not really involved they saw themselves primarily as subject specialists.
- e) The Consultative Committee on the Curriculum subject papers had little effect.

THE REAL MOVING FORCE WAS THE GOVERNMENT VIA THE SCOTTISH
EDUCATION DEPARTMENT

7. The main obstacles were:
- what to do with old junior secondary buildings and staff
 - parental opposition in selective secondaries
 - many people sincerely believed that the whole idea was unsound and unworkable, and bad for both good and poor pupils
 - lack of suitable materials

- mixed-ability classes
- indiscipline

8. The main advocates of comprehensive education were the Scottish Education Department, directed from England and staffed administratively by products of the private school/Oxbridge upper Civil Service who knew nothing about and cared less for Scottish education, but told HMSCI to get on with it.
9. Headteachers were allowed time to sort out the internal organisation of their schools. This eventually ran out. The apparently unimportant matter of school uniform was in fact significant. Nurture is in practice more important than nature. On the whole, poor homes do not produce literate children of wide-ranging interests, therefore poor homes produce children at the lower end of the academic scale. They did not feel accepted or successful in the comprehensive school, so they did not see why the hell they should buy school uniform, for them both expensive and stupid, rather than jeans. Hence the next move - to adapt the curriculum or give in, or enforce uniform by various appeals to the community spirit or by sanctions. Headteachers ran head-on into teachers of modern languages who were being exposed as elitist and inefficient; maths was seen as badly taught. Other subjects felt they were carrying the can and getting lumbered with the dregs. In addition, the Scottish Exam Board failed to adapt. Exams at Scottish Certificate of Education were - and still are - too academic, hence the Certificate of Secondary Education.

10. Where I worked, there was little reaction as the catchment area remained the same. There was considerable doubt, though, about things like mixed-ability. I do remember one parent coming with her very able daughter and going away again when I mentioned the word 'comprehensive', even though we had about 20 University entrants per year. Incidentally, I worked out a rough formula for success: 30% private housing, 70% council.
11. The Convener of the Education Committee introduced English headteachers in ----- to carry out the moves. Some were successful. Others withdrew. Some housing estates with overspill or decanting houses were allowed latitude in staff and cash and outdoor activities.
- Fee-paying schools have always existed. Their effect was to some extent negated by parents' finance. Besides, many are inefficient academically.
12. Circular 600 was a general guideline document, which was quickly modified. Internal practices and arrangements quickly became generalised; because headteachers have good lines of communication with each other.
14. The climate of opinion was generally favourable with many practical reservations. The Exam Board and the Consultative Committee on the Curriculum hadn't a clue as to their vital role.
15. Junior secondary schools were either absorbed or developed. Having taught at one time in a junior secondary school, I have mixed feelings. We did a good job and were respected in the way

that primary teachers are respected: we taught within their limits. There was acceptance, not bitterness. Nevertheless, the comprehensive system can and must be made to work.

16. secondary 1/2 : in our school full reports and case histories from the feeder primaries with remedial cases extracted. One Latin class in secondary 2.

secondary 3/4 : allocation after meetings with parents, with an open door for complaints, desires.

Secondary 1/secondary 2 classes had a similar mix of ability. By secondary 3 the usual academic practical division was appearing, and I had no hesitation in providing the best for the best. A foundation of comradeship from secondary 1/2 continued in sports, drama, music etc. Subject department heads applied their own classifications.

17. a) The curriculum in my school was not really affected by the advent of comprehensive schools, except that I was able to push Business Studies, hitherto despised, and tried to push Technical subjects but failed in the teeth of entrenched inferiority complexes in the staff.

b) Methods: a whole generation of older teachers had to be worked out of the schools, incapable of change, and given no help by the useless colleges, whose staff were - and are - hopelessly out of touch. Baillie Ruthven tried, but the job in Moray House nearly killed him.

18. Since there is no way of sacking inefficient teachers, they didn't have to change if they didn't want to. Change filtered in with the jeans-and-long-hair-brigade, whom I came to respect after seeing them teach.
19. I think that the comprehensive idea is in line with the idea of equality of opportunity, but weakened in the Scottish wish not to be hindered by the obvious deficiencies in practice. Bright pupils have always been able to get to University or find a good career.
20. Equality of opportunity in Scotland was seen as a ladder for the talents, the lad o' pairts, the development of abilities to the fullest extent possible. This path not to be obstructed by poverty or lack of facilities, inefficient teachers (perhaps privatisation of the State System as for coal, steel and rail, and other entrenched mediocrities, will be the answer) and inefficient, out-of-touch opinionated headteachers.
21. In my view a comprehensive school contains a mix of talent, ability and background. In practice, some unequal area intakes would require to be controlled to achieve a balanced mix. In the background lies the economic mix by which areas and schools can be distorted. But the economic background can be a spur to do well at school and get to University, and thus escape. This idealistic view was smirched by ideas of THEM and US, of pulling down high flyers, of levelling. These ideas emerged in some of the representatives on the School Council which most headteachers proceeded to nullify.

22. A great many more pupils proceed to tertiary education in 1986 than do in 1936, but do all pupils in 1986 develop their talents? In the end, its a question of finance. The nation can give the money or it can leave it to market forces.

On further reflection, the underlying sociological idea is sound, for there are many successful country comprehensives, but these are virtually unknown to city politicians and planners. Primary schools are successfully comprehensive.

The post-war building of huge district council housing estates and their subsequent abandonment were the root causes of the failures. They failed as communities - no shops, no pubs etc. Also, some schools had a disproportionate number of pupils from 'problem' families which ruined the mix. But the ideas that were in currency at the time (1960s) were:

'We're a' Jock Thomson's bairns' and 'The colonel's lady and Judy O'Grady are sisters under the skin'.

1. The idea of comprehensive education was in my mind a long time before academics started writing about it, or the Labour Party made it a newsworthy issue. I couldn't give you a year, but it was well before the 1960s.
2. Both education and politics were involved, and in both groups, educationists and politicians, there were those for and against. The whole comprehensive issue is very instructive about some of the basic facts of our society, and it shows very clearly, if ever there was any doubt, that education is heavily bound up with politics.
3. The Report appeared at a time when there was fresh hope after the war. Tom Johnston, the Secretary of State, thought he could get things going, get changes made. Both he and James Robertson were bitterly disappointed at the reception the Report on secondary education got. James Robertson had great prestige in the world of education. It is strange how a document which was regarded as wildly radical at the time of its publication gradually gained in respectability but lost its force thereby. There certainly was a feeling of ferment, but it bubbled away quietly and did not surface till much later. Robertson, a product of the Kirriemuir tradition in McPherson's phrase, was, not surprisingly, an influential exponent of the omnibus school, but the Report was ditched by the Scottish Education Department because its ideas did not receive a sympathetic hearing. A lot of senior Scottish Education Department staff at the time were classics graduates.

Never forget how much kudos was attached to people with degrees in Latin and Greek in the Scottish educational system. It was the qualification for success. People almost apologised if they were qualified in anything else.

The most direct influence the Report had was that people quoted bits of it at job interviews not long after it appeared.

4. Basically because it had been taken on board by the Labour Party and been made a political issue. It's strange, but at certain times, ideas come to prominence in the public consciousness and meet with a fair measure of agreement, but it often takes a generation before these same ideas issue forth in action. As the politician Harcourt said: 'WE'RE ALL SOCIALISTS NOW'. A certain amount of enthusiasm was due to a spill over from the post-war idealism. There was a hope of a better world with opportunities for all.
5. The main difference that Circular 600 made was that junior secondary schools began to disappear. A minority of these were doing innovative exciting work, but most were trying in vain to make a watered-down, senior secondary curriculum function. Circular 600 put junior secondary schools back into the competition by making the national exams available to those of their pupils who could take them. It had little effect on senior secondary schools, except to swell their numbers with pupils of a sort they had not previously seen, and thus possibly tarnish their previous selective image. Comprehensive education in Scotland, as envisaged in Circular 600 was not interpreted as a new concept: all it did was make academic education to senior

levels available to more working class kids than before.

6. 1) Most Her Majesty's Inspectors held the national exams in high regard. It was the incentive. They were the tentacles or feelers of the Scottish Education Department. When comprehensive education became the 'in thing', they threw out all the old ideas they had been peddling, and came with a whole new set. It was like saying we put lemonade in plastic bottles now, not glass bottles. They did a fair job at pushing the official line, but always pleasantly.
- 2) Labour politicians are intensely respectful of the educational hierarchy. They pushed the party line, but were careful to ensure that the academic part of the Scottish tradition was retained. When --- opened --- Academy he made a sincere speech in which he emphasised that we had an opportunity to achieve great and new things in the school. The Convener of the Education Committee in his speech agreed with all the the Secretary of State had said, but reminded all present that sight should not be lost of the academic life of the school, to which -- had not referred. For Labour Councillors, education of the academic type was a treasure not to be restricted to a social elite, but made available to all. In a similar way, Russia modelled its educational system after the war on Eton.
- 3) Advisers put good ideas about education into the kitty. Some of them were tried out with success. But they always tended to be at a superficial level, intensely practical, never as part of a fundamental re-examination of the curriculum or teaching approaches.

- 4) Directorate staff at the time had no (or very little) direct experience of comprehensive schools. The Kirriemuir tradition was strong among them, and the more able and articulate were able to manipulate their Committees round to their way of thinking. Nearly all of them in Scotland at the time would be adherents of an elitist outlook on education, and this dictated the pace of change as much as money.
- 6) The Consultative Committee on the Curriculum must have made some vague contribution to things. Its effect, however, is imponderable, and its hard to pinpoint any one major change that has resulted from its creation. How many teachers read the documents, apart from when going for an interview? I would find it difficult to say what influence it has had on practice.
7. The single most powerful obstacle to scupper any real hopes of a comprehensive system of education is the Scottish Certificate of Education exams. From the outset comprehensive education was seen as being set in the former educational context, i.e. intense competition for examination success. This nettle was not grasped, and so a restricted view predominated at all levels. What was required was a total reconstruction of education, not making academic education available to more working class pupils. The educational system governed is by the power of external exams. They control the thinking of all who come in contact with them. Ingrained elitist attitudes predominate in the minds of many people, for whom, in consequence, education equals memorising often meaningless chunks of information to pass THE exam, which will secure a good job or a place at University.

Also another problem is the very real and sharp dichotomy between the academic subjects and the so-called practical subjects in the Scottish mind. I suppose the division runs through all of society but it is particularly prominent in schools, where quite clearly some subjects have considerably more status than others. For many years, Classics and Mathematics were top of the academic league.

8. Labour politicians to a large extent sold it down the line. They had to, it was the 'in' thing. But remember it was a simplistic view that was being promoted. Directors and heads obviously played a part, but the extent of their commitment varied with their personal educational philosophy. So much depends on personal conviction and skill at convincing others.
9. A fair amount. You are even given encouragement when you 'innovate', provided what you are doing is seen as acceptable.
10. Parents were bemused. Comprehensive education was sold to them by the media- Harold Wilson appeared a lot on television during the lead up to the election, and gave the strongest support to it you can get. But he was quick to point out that it would merely mean more of the same but spread around, or GRAMMAR SCHOOLS FOR ALL. It was almost as if he - and others - wanted to put a 'cordon sanitaire' around themselves in case they lost votes. It had to be made look OK to the voters. So the view of comprehensive education that was coming across to the nation was a restricted establishment one, so the working class parents

accepted it readily, as they had been told it would open doors for their children. I'm sure middle class parents were much less keen, believing that their children would be damaged by attending schools the tone of which had been 'lowered' by admitting undesirable children. Those who feared for such an outcome and for the value of houses in their area, usually left or put their kids to the private sector. They had the resources to compensate for what they saw as a backward step in education. For them, the creation of comprehensive schools was like suddenly building tenements in Bearsden!

13. Streaming went on without question and on a wide basis in the new 'comprehensive' schools. There were a few ginger experiments with mixed-ability classes, but principal teachers with an eye on the Scottish Certificate of Education exams soon wanted to set, so the vision of change and experiment faded rapidly. Everything flows from the terminal national examination system. It dictates everything that happens in Scottish schools. It's utter stranglehold calls the tune. It seems obvious to me: we either must be honest and say we have education for exams, or we devise a new education for something else. Comprehensive schools effectively put pressure on more working class pupils to conform to the dominant middle class ethos in order to succeed in life. Their lack of success in this respect is seen in truancy figures, and the incidence of bad behaviour.

14. They had some effect, as they did lead to a fair amount of genuine open-mindedness and discussion about education. There was some positive thinking about what and how to teach children,

a welcome departure from the traditional academic didacticism. So I would say that Teachers' Centres and in-service courses were a useful catalyst, but only insofar as the examination system allowed them to be. It is, thus, not surprising that most work affected junior classes in secondary 1/2. By secondary 3/4 the big push was on for the Scottish Certificate of Education exams.

15. Schools like that have a tremendous cachet and great pulling power with parents. The name's the thing. They are considered to provide 'a good education'. State schools, however genuinely good they are, are always regarded as second best. These schools with reputations for providing 'a good education' are merely exam factories. In --- they caused intense rivalry among primary teachers to see who could score highest in the number of their pupils accepted to schools like ---.
16. Those who were members of the Labour Party said they were 'for' comprehensive schools, but that meant preserving the old against the new, against too many 'frills' or new ideas. The headteachers and parents ideas coincided - the purpose of the school was primarily to enable the bright kids to get on. So heads agreed with comprehensive education insofar as they saw it as an expansion rather than a recasting of the former system.
17. The 'two populations' existed in the new schools for a long time. There's no doubt about that. There was not much change of outlook. The school was run to identify and train the able to jump through exam hoops. Those who could not or would not were very much the poor relations, whose inferiority was rubbed into

them daily.

18. It will continue as long as there are exams. There's no future for education until exams go.
19. The advent of comprehensive schools had a minimal effect both on curriculum and on methods. Much stayed the same even though syllabuses changed because the exam did. A few genuine enthusiasts did good honest work in some schools by trying to foster a change of outlook or approach. So change was neither universal nor fundamental.
20. It had some effect; Some teachers were heard to say 'I never thought of that' or 'that's worth trying'. So it jolted the thoughts of some, but there were limited opportunities for these thoughts to issue in direct action. The good ideas came up against the brick wall of traditionalism which ensured that there was little scope to digress from the road leading to the exams.
21. The Kirriemuir tradition enabled people to say that we had had 'comprehensive' schools for years. The idea of the Scottish democratic intellect is a lot of nonsense, but it is both pervasive and powerful. It's no more democratic than fly in the air, but people believe it is. So we had 'comprehensive' schools only insofar as all pupils went to one school, but in no other sense. The introduction of comprehensive schools actually sustained the idea of the longstanding Scottish democracy and the myth of Scottish education being excellent. Hence the idea that with comprehensive schools it was being made available to more

children was very acceptable to all in Scotland.

22. a) This was the front slogan of the comprehensive movement, but since there was no parity of esteem, it was meaningless. All it meant was an equal chance for all children to show how academic (or not) they were. Thus, in Scotland, comprehensive schools allowed a higher proportion of children to sit exams, and thus recruited more able working class children to the ranks of the ruling classes. To that extent it was a success, but is that true comprehensive education?

b) A lot of people in the Labour Party subscribed to comprehensive education in principle but preferred to look after their own children's education in other ways. It was almost as if they were saying comprehensive education is fine as long as my kids are not affected by it.

23. Education and the role of the school have both been viewed in a very shallow way here in Scotland. I am reminded of all the rubbish that was talked during the Great Debate. It was neither great nor a debate, because the basic questions were never allowed to surface. All the talk in Scottish educational circles inevitably comes back to exams, presentation numbers or University entrance regulations. Comprehensive education in Scotland is largely rubbish, except some minor positive rub-offs, because not enough people have exposed themselves to its major implications.

A comprehensive school should start from the basic premise that the intelligence of the mass of the population is far higher than most teachers believe - as long as you don't equate intelligence

solely with passing exams. The whole education system in Scotland is at present a method of giving the majority of those who pass through it the distinct impression they are not much good at anything. Whereas, if you try to give all pupils a good conceit of themselves, there's no limit to what they can achieve. I think of a former pupil who became interested in and studied meteorology after having first taken up gliding. Comprehensive schools will never begin to make headway until they stop over-valuing the academic, which after all is only the ability to learn some facts and manipulate them using words. What's the point of being able to say: CAVOUR ACHIEVED BY DIPLOMACY MORE FOR ITALIAN INDEPENDENCE THAN GARIBALDI DID WITH HIS FIGHTERS, if you don't know what 'diplomacy' is? A school should be a place where the decision is taken to make the best use of all the assets of all the pupils. It should not have as its objective keeping a minority in power by progressive selection of the ablest. Ability should not be determined by IQ statisticians. There should be an obvious respect for human abilities which should be encouraged and not be prevented from surfacing. The need is to create inquiring minds in pupils, and a patience to explain in teachers. As wide a range of outlets as possible should be provided both in and out of school to permit children to reveal their individual capacities. Examination success is proof of ONE ability, not THE ability.

The potential has not been realised because they have been subjected to the desire of a minority to cling precariously to power by impressing the majority that they are not much good. The Labour Party has been seduced into climbing on to the elite ladder leading to social status and success by means of

education. Giving this flattening of the masses by a small elite, it is hardly surprising that so many people, especially the young, find ways to revel in modern society.

When I see what has happened to the comprehensive dream, I am reminded of the biblical question: ART THOU THE ONE WHO HAS COME OR MUST WE AWAIT ANOTHER? The answer of course is the latter. I would like to see an education system which did not indoctrinate ordinary kids to be unduly obsequious to people with titles. The essence of comprehensive education is creating in all an appreciation of and respect for all others, whatever their talents may be.

POSTSCRIPT

The key question then is this: how do you innovate in the educational system given the oppressive presence of an establishment thirled to the maintenance of the status quo? The answer is you cannot without a bloody revolution, and I'm not very sure that that would achieve all that much. Comprehensive education implies a radical rethink both about the place of schools in relation to society, and about the content of what is taught and the manner in which it is taught. For all that, comprehensive education has been with us twenty years, such a rethink has not occurred. The fundamental questions have still to be asked - then answered.

1. I can trace the roots of comprehensive education to the post-First World War obsession with Secondary education for all. Then came a whole series of Reports from Hadow in 1926 onwards, concerned with the best way to provide secondary education. A big influence in the push to set up schools specifically on comprehensive lines came from England, notably the London County Council.
2. There was no great ferment of pro-comprehensive ideas in Scotland in the 50s and early 60s. I would say that certain people were disposed to the introduction of comprehensive schools but there was no overt agitation for it. The believers were pushing the educational advantages. The motives for the actual introduction were primarily political; it was part of a mainly political drive to achieve a more unified and fair country, where opportunity was open to everyone. Schools were to be a reflection of society as well as tools to achieve social change.
3. The 1947 Report was - and is - regarded as excellent, well-written, even inspiring in its tone. I would say that it influenced a minority of people who were educationally aware, but its influence was not widespread. Much would depend on how hard it was pushed by Scottish Education Department and Directors. By and large, my feeling is that the Report was more revered in theoretical/academic terms, than it was influential in practice, although it is true that some of its ideas have since taken effect.

4. Partly because Labour came to power in 1964, partly because the powerful pressure groups were beginning to make loud noises for a change in educational policy. The other main contributory factor was that from the early to mid-50s the IQ exam/qualifying exam and the selectivity in secondary education which flowed from it was in its heyday. But gradually people began to look askance at determining life chances by allocation to particular courses at 12. By the early 60s, reaction to this practice was intensely critical, so that gradually a considerable consensus had built up that selection should go. There was a groundswell of discontent.
5. Where I was, Circular 600 had no direct impact, because I had begun the process of breaking down the division between certificate and non-certificate classes by instituting bridging classes. So, for other similar schools, Circular 600 merely accelerated this process. But a great many schools at that time were geared to selectivity, and ideas of bridging classes or education for leisure had not yet seen the light of day. The age of teachers was an important factor. Keenness to innovate is a function of age. It was, therefore, very difficult to move academic staff whose sole concern was academic success in Scottish Certificate of Education exams, and the maintenance of the reputation of the school in achieving that success. Those who did turn their attention to catering for the non-academic often did so by short-term social mixing - in Physical Education, Music etc. The pace at which Circular 600 was implemented depended entirely on the headteacher.

6. 1) From my own experience, I have always found Her Majesty's Inspector very helpful, and I have a high regard for their knowledge. They had a crucial role vis-a-vis comprehensive education. They were propagators and disseminators of the comprehensive gospel. Heads could use them if they had staffs who were reluctant to change.
- 2) Local politicians were divided on party lines, and had the obvious political allegiances. My impression in more rural areas was that councillors were reluctant to change the selective system because it had served their area well. Children had profited from it, and gone on to a University and a successful career. So I found councillors reluctant to change.
- 3) Advisers were thin on the ground, but even later their influence was minimal and negligible.
- 4) The reaction of Directorate staff varied. Many showed reluctance to change, but it was never open. They had a critical influence in that they could delay the introduction of comprehensive schools though not oppose them totally. Very few were active in their support for the new system.
- 6) The Consultative Committee on the Curriculum produced papers which were useful in getting people to think, but they had little impact on the early implementation of the comprehensive schools. Many people hardly knew of its existence due to its failure to communicate to schools.
7. The main obstacles were (1) many teachers were geared to academic success, and (2) consequently needed convincing that all pupils

matter. There were many doubters. Even people in the Labour Party. There was a widespread fear that its introduction would lead to a fall in standards. Also, no extra resources were made available by the government, so that the whole thing was introduced on a shoestring.

9. Headteachers had wide latitude within broad guidelines. The pace of change was entirely in my hands in all the schools of which I was head.
10. Parental reaction varied: those parents with children who would have previously failed the 'quali' felt they had a better deal, more opportunities. Other parents who felt the prestige of previously 'good' schools would be impaired were hostile.
12. Yes, the neighbourhood concept operated against comprehensive schools, especially in cities. Selection by the primary exam gradually was replaced by selection of 'better' comprehensive schools by those families who could afford it. Some estate agents even mentioned schools by name in their newspaper adverts.
13. There was a slow change within schools, but now I would say it was quite marked. The strongest feature is that the rigid division into academic and non-academic sections has been broken down. In the omnibus schools, it was not the schools that mattered, it was the course you were allocated to.
14. Teachers' Centres and in-service courses blossomed in the late 60s and 70s. Those who did go tried to act as change agents in

schools but the very people who needed to go did not. In-service courses should have been made compulsory for everyone.

15. Fee-paying and private schools are bound to have had a creaming effect on comprehensive schools, although much depends on where in the country we are talking about. Edinburgh is a unique case, Glasgow to a much lesser extent. The private sector is a bolthole for the middle class. The whole issue turns on the tension between freedom in society and equality. If you take the latter too far you are on the way to a totalitarian state. Freedom in education is basic to a democracy, and is incompatible with a uniform type of educational provision forced on everyone. Private education is a necessary countervailing balance to the danger of establishing a monolithic state system. That would be bad. I would, however, add that independent/private schools should receive no money whatever from the state.
16. Heads were divided, and tended to reflect the divisions and doubts in society. The most sceptical were those in charge of senior secondary schools. Many of the people who supported it did so without realising that a comprehensive school was essentially different from the omnibus school we had had in Scotland for many years.
17. I would say that it changed effectively, but only ultimately. Distinctions remained for a long time, especially in city areas. Reorganisation was not properly introduced in -----until 1973. Overall, looking back, I would say that the general quality of education provided is much higher but with individual

gains to the upgraded junior secondary schools and losses to the prestigious senior secondary schools, which have lost their dominant place in the structure of the educational system and have been levelled down.

18. A comprehensive school should aim to realise the academic potential of all its pupils. This is what Standard grade is designed to do. Differentiation is essential to satisfy all abilities. I allow setting by subject from Christmas in secondary 1, if the head of department wishes it. Maths and French invariably do. But there must flexibility so that the sharper distinctions are blurred. Grade related criteria were intended to go some way towards this. Final decisions should be as late as is possible.
19. Not very much. The established pattern and model was the senior secondary school with its academic diet. This was as regrettable as it was inevitable, given the lack of in-service training. There was a long tradition of the iron-curtain division between certificate and non-certificate courses and, therefore, between certificate and non-certificate pupils. The main thrust of comprehensive reorganisation was on the external structure, not on the internal content. The latter was not matched to the former. It was an institutional reform in the main. Attempts were made to change what went on in schools - Brunton, Ruthven, etc - but they presumed a differentiated population in their recommendations.
20. A thorough change was prevented by:

- teachers' training and background. They were academic animals with elitist attitudes
- the exam system. There was no connection between the creation of the Exam Board and comprehensive schools. The Board was created to deal with the volume of work caused by the post-war bulge, and co-ordinate the activities of a national examination structure. Officers of the Scottish Education Department were against assessment for all until the early 70's. It was only at the behest of the Board's Examinations Committee that Dunning was set up. It was really the catastrophic happenings after raising of the school leaving age in 1972 that brought the curriculum and its assessment closer together. So for a long time the effect of the comprehensive system on teachers' ideas was marginal, in my view.

21. The traditional burgh schools had reinforced the well-known democratic attitude to secondary education in Scotland. These schools had a socially comprehensive intake, but reallocated the pupils to courses from which it was thought they could benefit. So, in one sense, the comprehensive school was closely articulated with the Scottish tradition, in another not so well.

22. a) Since Knox, education has been open to all classes, but the predominant conception in the minds of those who ran the system was that the provision of courses was to be decided thereafter by intelligence or academic potential as judged by it.

b) Yes, it was the lad o' pairts guarantee of academic success, so many in the Labour Party clung to selection.

23. A comprehensive school is one which takes all children from a locality and provides a sufficiently wide range of courses to meet their needs. Flexibility in its internal organisation rather than rigid divisions is essential.
24. No, the potential of the comprehensive school has not been tapped. The bulk of comprehensive schools do not stretch the able adequately, nor are the least able provided adequately for. There has been a failure to give the proper attention to the content. Another aspect which has been neglected is the surrounding community. There should be more emphasis on a partnership between school and community to achieve a common purpose.

1. For me the moves to comprehensive education came entirely from outside schools. The word 'comprehensive' and all the related vocabulary items which it introduced were unknown until the mid 1960s. It all just came as I became a headteacher.
2. All major educational advance must be political. Major institutional change is always politically inspired. The Labour Government clearly had the comprehensive school as part of its national policy of social betterment, of egalitarian ideas and ideals. So it was a political initiative in the interests of creating a fairer and more just society. Other forces in society were also at work: wider forces in society began to question its respected institutions. It was a case of 'all change', and this shook the world of Scottish education which was conservative. Conditioned by their own education and experience, teachers tended to accept in a supine way a system they thought was as good and fair as it could be. The attitude of administrators was very much laissez-faire. Less able children had a chip on their shoulder about their lot, but despaired of being able to do very much about it. There were jobs for everyone, so you just accepted the place the system gave you. Given the widespread acceptance of a separate system, there was no move that I recall from the teaching force to change to a comprehensive system.
3. The 1947 Report was largely a dead letter and never had the influence it should have. This model of educational thinking had much more influence abroad than in Scotland. It represented the

post-war thinking of the Beveridge type, but it received no official backing or push, so it was not significantly translated into action. It is a splendid essay on education, the good ideas of which were seen to upset an educational system which was believed to be the right one.

5. The main implications of Circular 600 were that academic-minded teachers had to face pupils of a junior secondary type, whom they had joyfully left after having done their junior secondary 'stint' while awaiting a job in a more prestigious senior secondary school. And not only were pupils of all abilities under one roof, in some cases they were in the same class. This was seen as the supreme threat to the senior secondary school and its traditions, and all sorts of strategies were devised, either from honestly-held beliefs or from cynicism and hostility, to avoid too much change to accepted practices. There was also a challenge to junior secondary teachers who had to teach pupils of high intelligence. The changeover struck at the heart of the system, and caused great strain. Many people retired early and some actually died from the pressure. Many made all sorts of plausible excuses to dodge the column.
6. i) Her Majesty's Inspectors had a considerable input in developing comprehensive education. You only became aware of them as a headteacher. Prior to that you regarded them as a nuisance or a nonentity. Later they became your allies in educational thinking, and make up for colleagues you have lost in the staffroom. They are the principal conveyors of Scottish Education Department thinking. They are and always have been

influential, even though they are not always accepted or appreciated. I was told by them at the time that they were looking to certain schools to make a go of comprehensive education and these could then be used as models.

- ii) Local politicians were both keen on the idea but surprisingly slow to implement it. They didn't know much about it, only that it was going to give all pupils a fair crack of the whip.
- iii) The Directorate staff were in no hurry to move in my experience. They tended to like the status quo, so change meant a lot of trouble for them. They thought they had very good senior secondary schools and/or omnibus schools already, in which their staffs did what was expected of them: the feeling was very much that if you had good cooks in charge of good ingredients you had to get a good meal. My impression was that Her Majesty's Inspectors and/or local politicians had to exert pressure on some unwilling Directors to move a bit faster.
- iv) Advisers did not play a significant role till the 70s. They, being no more than good ex-teachers, took a canny approach.
- v) Again with the Consultative Committee on the Curriculum, its momentum and influence increased much later. It gradually came to carry weight, and became one of the instruments of curricular change. Remember that the word 'curriculum' and ideas of curriculum development only became subjects of discussion from the mid-60s onwards. They were not an issue in the first 20 years after the war. The power of the Consultative Committee on the Curriculum was in inverse proportion to its noise.

7. The two major obstacles to the successful introduction of comprehensive education were vested educational interests and parental apathy. There was a lack of concern, no hue and cry and even ignorance about what was happening. It just happened.
9. I would say that headmasters were, in the main, acted upon rather than acting on the matter of comprehensive education. The head was - and is - solely responsible for the three pillars of any school - curriculum, administration and tone. In effect, much depended on individual beliefs and philosophy, and the way one reacted to what were fundamentally new ideas.
12. Apart from the head, the pace and extent of internal change depended on principal teachers of subjects. They, too, displayed a variety of reaction. Some were very reactionary, especially in Maths and Modern Languages.
13. It is hard to quantify the impact of Teachers' Centres and in-service training. The potential was greatly reduced by the fact that the very teachers who most needed to attend courses did not.
15. Many so-called 'comprehensive' schools were in fact little more than reluctant senior secondary schools. Academic disciplines retained a fierce hold on things, so that internal divisions between pupils progressively became apparent, and were usually obvious by secondary 3 - you had the 'toughs' and the 'bourgeoisie', so to speak. The shadow of the Scottish Certificate of Education made the intellectual inequalities more apparent, so that many of the good ideas about integrating

different types of pupils did not materialise.

16. It is very difficult, in trying how to group children, to do justice to the most able, while at the same time giving a sense of comfort and worth to those who are not in the academic league. Inevitably, a compromise between mixed-ability and setting has to be adopted. There is great rivalry between schools in the same town, and in the early days, heads of the newer comprehensive schools were very keen to ensure that able pupils got as fair a deal with them as they would have had in the senior secondary.
17. Of course, the whole approach has changed, but the extent varies
+
18. with the subject. Because comprehensive teaching is harder, teachers were obliged to face up to and find answers to central issues.
19. The advent of comprehensive education was a totally new concept for Scottish education, which suddenly was expected to make an honest attempt to integrate groups of children it had formerly segregated. But it took a long time, and was beset with many problems. For example, a comprehensive school is not the same thing in Barnton as it is in Easterhouse. The result is that I often wonder if, ironically, the new system did less well by the able child from a humble background. Now, of course, the wheel has come full circle with placing requests, the assisted places scheme etc.
21. A comprehensive school should have as its motto SUB SPECIE AETERNITAS - all pupils are as equal in the sight of God as

teachers, and the future 1st class honours graduate deserves the same amount of attention and help as does the future roadsweeper. A comprehensive school aims at the best for the most.

22. No, the comprehensive school has not achieved its potential. Firstly, it wasn't off to a good start, and was tackled with various degrees of enthusiasm. It suffered because of human nature and the ineducability of pupils, staff, administrators, and politicians. It was - and is - an ideal, to which only aspirations can be made. The major problem now is that the principles on which it was founded - JUSTICE, HUMANITY, VALUE OF THE INDIVIDUAL - are out of step with the prevailing ideology of materialism, and the desire for the instant gratification of desires. Our age exemplifies the cult of selfishness and cynicism. I would like to think that the efforts of all those involved have not been in vain, but I do not honestly know.

1. Where local councils were Labour controlled, party political squabbles were not a worry. There was a fairly quick physical conversion to a comprehensive structure, because in the early 1960s the Council had decided to build new schools in the major centres of population. So there was a sort of general 'excuse-me' leading up to Circular 600. The move had been in the air for some time before it became national policy. The post-war bulge, coupled with a desire to get rid of the junior secondary/senior secondary split in the major centres which had major and deep-rooted effects on the community, meant that Circular 600 really only gave a focus to ideas which had been gathering momentum. I think in passing that while many authorities exhorted/encouraged heads to 'go comprehensive', the Director here issued explicit instructions: secondary 1 classes had to be randomly but alphabetically divided and no Latin was to be taught in secondary 1. In secondary 2 you were allowed to do as you liked.
2. The moves were undoubtedly political, inspired by that old, left-wing radical idealism: get rid of social inequality, give the bairns a chance, education is the way to get on in the world, etc. Only a minority of teachers believed in widening opportunities for all children. People in teaching split into two camps: the old guard who bemoaned the demise of the good senior secondary schools, and the younger people in the vanguard of change willing to make an enthusiastic contribution to the new world. The bulk of teachers and headteachers were a little less than enthusiastic about comprehensivisation, and tried to ignore

it in the vain hope that it might go away. But it didn't.

3. I suppose the 1947 Report had some influence. It became known though only when fuelled by the feelings of the 1960s, and when the tablets on high said that the comprehensive school was 'in'. There was a very pronounced feeling North of the Border that the comprehensive school was bulldozed along the road as the result of a bad situation in England, with its very fragmented educational system which only admitted a small percentage of children to grammar school. The feeling up here was that we had had comprehensive education for years in small towns and rural areas. In the omnibus school the wheat was winnowed from the chaff. That was the accepted way of doing things. The English problem was solved by adopting the comprehensive school as the pattern which was then foisted on the Scottish system which it distorted. I think you have to ask questions about many of the people who implemented the policy up here; their educational credentials were impeccable, but it really was a hit or miss kind of affair. The will and intention were there, but the educational basis was, to say the least, suspect.
4. Egalitarianism dominated sociological thinking in the 1960s. There was a realisation that much ability was being wasted in schools. The economy was expanding, and the influence of events in America (Sputnik, technology, etc) was strongly felt. The feeling was that the comprehensive school would enable everyone to get Ordinary grades and succeed.
6. a) Her Majesty's Inspectors at the time were suspect in the extreme.

The period 1965-7 was a watershed for Her Majesty's Inspectors. Up till then, schools were places in which only insignificant changes took place. The job of the inspector was defined according to a fixed set of criteria: school inspectors, oral examining and certificating teachers. Then the system changed suddenly. The ground rules were changed, and Her Majesty's Inspectors were as lost as the practitioners, as the more honest of them had the decency to admit. They had no fixed set of criteria for the new set up, though they had to act as if they did. The Scottish Education Department officials instructed them what to advocate - mixed-ability and the common course. I liken them at this period to bees buzzing round gathering pollen. They quickly latched on to anything new in a suddenly innovatory climate. They oversaw the revolution away from the heat and dust in the calm of the conference or working party committee room. The arrival of the comprehensive had a lasting effect on the prestige of Her Majesty's Inspectors, which they got back only with Munn and Dunning.

- b) Councillors were all for the comprehensive school and expanding educational opportunities, in the sincerely held belief that the world would become a better place. Without being disparaging, I felt that their optimism was misplaced.
- c) Directors in general left schools to get on with it within parameters. They were concerned with the logistics of provision. Headteachers were largely left to their own devices. We never saw them very often.
- d) Early advisers were only appointed in the practical subjects. After 1967 there was a sudden influx of advisers. Like Her

Majesty's Inspectors, they were largely feeling their way, and not primarily concerned with the implementation of comprehensive education. Their brief was to develop subjects, and solve the problems of mixed-ability groups. They were essentially facilitators and suppliers.

- e) The influence of the Consultative Committee on the Curriculum was minimal. You either read the publications or you didn't. Much depended on the job you had. Some heads and advisers felt an obligation to read them. The only ones that had any influence were those that were distilled and pushed. Much in schools depended on the headteachers and principal teachers. In general, subject papers had more impact than general/educational ones.

7. The obstacles to the introduction of comprehensive education as I saw them were:

- convincing people that the change was desirable
- a gradual realisation that the former academic approach and diet were unsuitable
- buildings; it was much easier in a new school
- the previous experience of staff which made them unconvinced
- teaching approaches and materials - both were inappropriate
- interested parents, who began to worry about falling standards
- the effects of the Primary Memorandum which made secondary teachers distrustful of new-fangled approaches
- resources.

It was a long time before the cost implications of comprehensive education were realised. The selective system was favoured for so long because it was economical. It maximised the

effectiveness of the resources you wanted to spend on education. That brings in priorities and politics. To introduce proper comprehensive education would have cost much more money than was made available. To many people thought it was merely a question of bricks and mortar.

10. The social make-up of ---- meant that, in general, parents were only too willing to accept the school's word about the education of their children.
13. In-service courses helped those who wanted to be helped. A lot of money was spent on both management and subject courses, and teachers' centres sprang up in old primary schools. A whole group of teachers who exemplified 'good practice' became in-service pundits. But the whole thing was untidy, as some schools were at varying points of development in varying subjects. Most ideas or courses were picked up over coffee or at the bar. Basically, schools and departments got reputations for being innovative and 'having a go'. The best was organised by advisers.
14. a) It is fair to say that, as older headteachers retired and new men came in, comprehensive education got a better chance. At the changeover, senior secondary headteachers were kings in their own land, respectable gentlemen who were concerned to uphold academic tradition, and get as many pupils as possible into University. This old guard saw change as inimical, and thought that younger people who advocated change were making a virtue out of necessity. So really, headteachers represented a spectrum of

views, but many made only minor modifications to the status quo. Another generalisation would be that the West of Scotland was more radical and innovative than the East and North East where change was approached very tentatively. The HAS is a much broader body now. Headteachers are much less inclined to stop and stifle change than they were.

- b) I had it lucky - a new school and consequently no need to change a staff or inherit another person's ideas. Very slowly teachers realised that they were working in a new world. The failures of the old approaches and methods began to become obvious. Old accepted and cherished facts of life began to be questioned: homework was not done, discipline was not the same, pupils were not all numerate or literate, 'remedial' pupils appeared. Some subjects adapted badly - Maths, French. Other subjects adapted more easily. Things have changed radically, but only after blood sweat and tears. Change was gradual and achieved by the 'young Turks' in the face of opposition from the 'harkers-back'. Some things never caught on - group methods, because it was too bloody difficult. Most teachers accepted the comprehensive ideal. It was the practice they couldn't come to terms with. Some made valiant attempts to come to grips with the problems it threw up. The problem was that no one could talk with authority about comprehensive education. This gave way to punditry by 'hero innovators'. Those who had done something new were seized upon and became missionaries. But the major problem was that innovation was bedevilled by being left to exceptional practitioners or special personalities who worked in exceptional circumstances. A whole group of people sprang up without whom no respectable conference or course was complete. The whole system

was dependent on these high priests of change. There was almost total reliance on the individual, who almost invariably was quickly promoted to glory for his efforts. Hardly any attention was paid to the average teacher who worked in average circumstances or worse. A result was that many people were left after conferences with grave doubts about how applicable what they had just heard would be in their own schools.

19. I do not think that the introduction of the comprehensive school represented a radical change in Scottish education. It was a political move inspired by egalitarian, anti-elitist feelings and a realisation that the system was failing to provide enough talent. It also coincided with a growing concern about school buildings in the light of the post-war bulge. As I have said, there was a powerful conviction that Scottish omnibus schools were comprehensive anyway and, in theory at least, gave all children opportunities. If all did not take advantage of the chance, then the fault lay with the individual pupil and/or his parents. In my opinion the architects of the comprehensive school did not take adequate account of individual commitment to, and interest in, education. Creating the comprehensive school and its opportunities does not guarantee a revival of interest in education, or a desire to participate in it.

In many senior secondary schools there were many pupils from good working class backgrounds - a good social mix, but the difference was that they were there because their families had a belief in academic education for social advancement and to prevent children following their fathers into mills and foundaries.

The comprehensive school favoured those who would have been on

the borderline of senior secondary/junior secondary schools. It did a lot for a broad number of middle-of-the-road pupils. It did not do so much for high flyers who had to work against the odds to achieve academic attainment in a much less pressurised and competitive atmosphere. Performing up to your limit was a notion absent from the comprehensive school. Many able children settled for a comfortable passage. The comprehensive school did not do as much as it could have for the able. The less able also lost out because they were exposed to things they could not do or had no interest in, and because many staff were at a loss what to do with them.

Many teachers in comprehensive schools held on to the same attitudes as had existed in the old senior secondary/junior secondary system. As a result many children were exposed to pressure to do well academically. This brought about a slow and reluctant realisation that his hope was ill-founded. Also, other teachers put too much reliance on the ideological aspects of comprehensive education without realising their implications, after a relatively easy achievement of the physical reality of the comprehensive school.

2. I do not know what the sources of comprehensive policy initiatives are, or how far back they can be traced, but there is not the slightest doubt that the impetus was almost wholly political. Very little would have happened from within the teaching profession had it not been for Circular 600 and Circular 614. These were almost bulldozed through, and there certainly was no feeling in the profession for comprehensive education. Sure, it was official Educational Institute of Scotland policy, but a frequent rejoinder was: 'Most of Scotland's schools are comprehensive anyway'. This was not true of course: what it meant was that many schools in rural areas were local schools which took all the children from round about. The merging of junior secondary and senior secondary schools was seen as a city problem. I would say that moves to abandon segregation in Scotland, as far as they existed, arose from hostility to the obvious unfairness of junior secondary schools, and to the dreadful places some of them had turned out to be in reality, rather than from any embracing of the ideals of comprehensive education. On that issue the profession was divided. Senior secondary staffs in particular were reluctant to entertain any idea of giving more advantage to less able children at the expense of the most able. Feelings ran high that good established schools with excellent academic reputations would be destroyed out of all recognition by the switch to comprehensive education.

3. The 1947 Report was certainly not influential among teachers;

only a few would ever have read it. Most probably did not know of its existence. It is one of these reports that is always being quoted: some of its passages have an almost permanence of meaning, and no doubt people will still be quoting it one hundred years from now. But, in general, it was not widely discussed, and certainly not appreciated or acted upon. It was used as a source of ideas by some enthusiasts. College and university staff know it and teach about it. But it has never held a central place in the mind of policy makers. It was never mentioned once when I was in the Inspectorate.

4. It became attractive in the mid 60's because Labour was elected in 1964. This gave speed and impact to the organisational change. A lot of things came together then - there was a desire for change, for a re-examination of what were cherished practices in Scottish education. Something I resented very much was the overt way members of Her Majesty's Inspectors were used by the Scottish Office to push the new philosophy with headteachers and directors. Of course, one didn't make such feelings public in the Civil Service. At the time I was a selectivist, but the experience of social deprivation in the West made me change to a comprehensivist. There were conferences and seminars arranged by Her Majesty's Inspectors for the heads and directors, mainly designed to work out the practical implications of Circular 600 and Circular 614. But there was a feeling of 'well it's here, but who decided it was an educationally good idea anyway?' It is true of course that many official reports of the period included arguments for and pointed in the direction of a comprehensive system. The crucial question to be asked is: what was in the

minds of those charged with making the changeover work? How did they interpret 'comprehensive' education and 'the comprehensive school'? Headteachers got no directions, so there were as many definitions as there were headteachers.

5. The differences made in practice by Circulars 600/614 depended on the local authority policy and the enthusiasm of headteachers. For example, when I took over at ----- it was obvious that not much had happened in ----- in the first four years. It was only in the 1970's that people really got down to facing up to the implications of comprehensive education. In my opinion, the two circulars did not make much impact in what happened in schools. Issues were dodged, and much lip-service was paid to the comprehensive philosophy. Changes were confined to closing or amalgamating junior secondary schools, and changing or inventing names for the new schools. So a lot of schools were called 'comprehensive'. Many had to operate with at least one annexe. So the change was a nominal one, which did not confront nitty-gritty issues, and which did not have a dramatic effect on approaches to education. For me, the real catalyst was raising of the school leaving age in 1972.
6. 1) Her Majesty's Inspectors as I have said were sent out to make comprehensive education a reality. They were expected to provide answers to the question: HOW ARE WE GOING TO DO THIS NEW COMPREHENSIVE BUSINESS IN PRACTICE? They reflected and advocated the educational philosophy of the government of the day, just as the present Her Majesty's Inspectors are pushing a Tory line in educational matters.

- 2) Much depended on the political colour of the Council and the relationship between the Director and the Convener of the Education Committee.
 - 3) I am not really sure of what contribution advisers made. The advisory service was one of the things which gelled in the late 60's, a period of expansion. They were created in response to the widespread desire, started by Sputnik, to take a fresh look at education, and what and how things were being taught in schools.
 - 4) Officials for the most part with Her Majesty's Inspectors working out the practical implications of the new approach. External structures took pride of place over internal organisation to start with.
 - 5) The first Consultative Committee on the Curriculum was eyewash. It was created to provide a committee for Sir Norman Graham with an educational remit. He saw himself as an educationist. Even the second Consultative Committee on the Curriculum was a bit of a dead loss. Neither had any influence or impact in schools, as was discovered with embarrassment. It was only later that the Consultative Committee on the Curriculum was given teeth. Now it is a very powerful and influential body.
7. The main obstacles in ----- were:
- a) the attitudes of those charged with managing the change
 - b) the very pronounced pecking order of excellence in schools -
SELECTIVE/FEE-PAYING, TOP SENIOR SECONDARY SCHOOLS
COMPREHENSIVES. Those of the latter group in housing estates

were very much the bottom of the heap.

9. The latitude accorded to heads was very wide. Committees took very broad decisions on policy matters, but it was very much up to heads what happened to these decisions in schools. Personal interpretations played a very big part in deciding what sort of comprehensive system actually emerged.
10. The most notable majority reaction among parents was apathy. Only a small group of middle-class activists formed pressure groups for or against, depending on their views, and how they saw the new system affecting their own children.
12. Yes, there were some real problems. If the public and the media had accepted these schools for what they are all would have been well. Unfortunately, the only criterion on which a school's success is judged is academic - the number of Scottish Certificate of Education passes. Area schools have so few 'academic' pupils that they can only come far down the league tables we saw recently in the press. Unfortunately, this criterion disguises much good work that is done in these schools. I should perhaps add that I am totally opposed to social engineering for educational ends. Each school must accept intake as it is and do its best for them all.
13. I cannot go into details for all schools, but the general rate of internal change was very slow, with pockets of individual enthusiasts who moved faster. There was a lot of dragging of heels behind a facade of change. For example, ----- was one of

the first ----- schools to adopt the common course in secondary 1 - in 1970!

14. Teachers' Centres and in-service education also came much later than it should have. When it did start, there was a flurry of activity. There was a mood of going places, of growth, of 'let's have a go'. Teachers were willing to give up their own time to learn about new ideas in spite of their fears and apprehensions about change. Things are a bit different now.
16. The reactions were very mixed: a lot depended on what kind of school you were in. Some hardly changed at all, some were not sure or scared, and other made changes according to their own definitions of 'comprehensive education'. Attempts were made to introduce improvements by ensuring that appointments to headteacher/principal teacher posts went to those who were favourably disposed to comprehensive principles.
17. Basically, segregation into academic/non-academic groups continued till raising of the school leaving age, which really brought a lot of issues out into the open. The changes in secondary 3/4 filtered down in their effects to secondary 1/secondary 2. Though Munn and Dunning took a long time to come, it was set up in response to increasing discontent with the curriculum and assessment procedures that were in use for a supposedly comprehensive population.
18. There is no one right answer to pupil grouping. Much depends on the headteacher, his philosophy, and the views of his principal

teachers. My view is that should be complete mixed-ability in secondary 1 with some setting secondary 2, so that the most able are not held back. There is no doubt, however, that the pace in the old senior secondary school was too fast for many children, with the result that a great many pupils were written off as 'dregs' who in fact were of high ability.

19. No, not until the arrival of raising of the school leaving age. It was interesting to see that a prevailing reaction to Munn and Dunning was to visualise 3 levels. The notion of overlap and of teaching the same curriculum at different levels was conceptually difficult, if not impossible, for many teachers to grasp. They welcomed recognition for all in the form of a national certificate, but preferred separate courses.
20. There are still a fair number who are not 'tuned in' to the comprehensive way of thinking. But there was an undeniable surge in thinking on the part of many, a growth in the level of thinking about the job of teaching. But for the present Educational Institute of Scotland action, I think there was enough momentum generated for us to have been nearly home and dry. Initial resistance was basically a fear of a new language people didn't understand. So talks, seminars, in-service, papers etc gradually began to get the message across in all subjects. Change was slow and support was slow, but it came. If enough resources had been made available when they were required to fund changes seen as desirable, teachers would have moved more quickly, out of a sense of professionalism. If appropriate salary levels had been introduced, they would have moved even

more quickly.

21. The Scottish tradition for years was based on the 'lad o'pairts' notion of the able but poor boy making his way via selective secondary education to a university education, which would subsequently open doors to a good position and a comfortable life. Of course, omnibus schools took all children into one building but arranged them in separate classes according to general ability arrived at from various transfer tests. Only in cities did you have the emotional trauma and personal stigma of segregation and the junior secondary school. So comprehensive education, in the sense of doing one's best for ALL children was foreign to Scottish education. There was no comprehensive tradition in that sense. There was a basic splitting of children into 'the academic' and 'the rest'. The latter got a watered-down academic diet which failed to pick up their considerable potential abilities. They were seen as having no ability because the benchmark was academic ability. In fact, they had many and varied other abilities which the system did not cater for.
22. I have an impression of a different Scottish view of this concept. Up here there was the feeling that equality of opportunity already existed to a far greater degree than in England, since a higher proportion of pupils went to senior secondary schools than did to grammar schools. This was a reflection of the Scottish desire to promote the able and nurture them academically. So I would say that most people thought the old system was as fair as it could be, and so there was not the same intensity of socialist principles or such a bitter sense of

injustice as in England. As I said, however, the dreadful failure of junior secondary schools caused people to question the unfairness of segregation at 12, with its explicit rejection of a sizeable proportion of the population as inferior beings who had been written off at the stroke of a pen. Many people in the Labour Party still favoured selective schooling for their own children, knowing that the 'old school tie' principle was still helpful later in life. It is difficult to avow one's socialist principles when one feels that strict adherence to them might disadvantage one's own children.

23. A comprehensive school enables all children to develop every talent they have, WHATEVER THESE TALENTS ARE. So in a true comprehensive school there are a multiplicity of criteria of success, not merely an academic one, to which all others are subordinate. There should be no rejection or feelings of inferiority in those who do not or cannot live up to academic criteria. Such a school should also have explicit social aims - bringing together as they do children from all walks of life. Every opportunity should be taken to foster mutual recognition and wider horizons, by exposing pupils to things they would never have seen but for being at a comprehensive school.
24. Definitely not. The main stumbling blocks I would see as:
- lack of resources
 - the initial reactions of teachers, though there has been an improvement in recent years
 - financial cutbacks
 - snobbishness and the persistence of the academic tradition in

Scottish schools

- the current cynical hostility arising from the perceived failure of the comprehensive system, which could lead to a revival of elitist views.

1. The source of comprehensive policy initiatives was undoubtedly political. Although Scotland has a national education system it follows national trends, certainly in major changes of this nature. So the move was political, and Scotland followed the lead given by England. Various pressure groups had been hard at work too, moulding certain sections of public opinion. I remember going to a meeting called by Her Majesty's Inspectors at ----- . There was no question of discussing whether we were to have comprehensive schools. Circular 600 was taken as given, and the question was of how to implement its proposals. The fact also that a Labour government had taken office made the comprehensive question much more definitive - there was a feeling somehow that it was all just going to happen, and that was that.
2. I think the 1947 Report was very important, not at all at the time it appeared. But, as it foreshadowed so much of what happened in later decades, it has had a persuasive, subtle influence, almost like a reference manual. It contained the germ of many successive reports. It foundered on the innate conservatism of the Scottish educational establishment. Andrew McPherson's depiction of the Kirriemuir tradition and its strength is absolutely spot on. The lad o'pairts, although he never actually existed, has proved a very potent image in the Scottish mind, and has accounted for much that has happened.
3. It was due both to educational and political moves, the latter being the stronger in my view.

4. There was a complex of reasons why comprehensive education became attractive in the 1960's:
- it was a period of rapid and violent social change
 - throughout society there was a challenge to established thinking on many matters, and, of course, to authority (freedom of speech, long hair, 'flower power', youth culture etc)
 - there was a growing awareness that the working class had been denied the opportunities they should have had - a challenge, if you like, to privilege in education
 - there was a growing dissatisfaction with selection at the end of primary schooling. Research projects were gradually accumulating evidence of the blatant unfairnesses in the system
 - it was the era of expansion, hope and optimism e.g. Robbins. There was plenty of money to invest in what was thought to be socially beneficial
 - pressure groups like A.C.E. and C.A.S.E. were hammering away colouring public opinion in favour of extending opportunities.
5. I think you have to draw a distinction between urban and rural areas here. In the latter, Circular 600 would not make much change organisationally. These omnibus schools were in fact bi-lateral, with marked distinctions between groups of pupils. Changes there would be in the curriculum, with some children being exposed to subjects they had not previously had. In towns, these would be more organisational change. A lot would depend on logistics - upgrading junior secondary schools, merging some junior secondary and senior secondary schools, building problems,

staff shortages. There the rate of change was variable.

6. a) Her Majesty's Inspectors played an important part, even though as individuals they varied in their level of commitment to the new order. Her Majesty's Inspectors are very powerful figures who are listened to in Scottish education - there's no gainsaying that. Since we in Scotland do not have an 'education minister', Her Majesty's Inspectors are relied on to go forth from the Scottish Education Department and promote official, policy. That's their job! They went round and sowed the seeds of the comprehensive initiatives at conferences and seminars. They disseminated examples of successful work they encountered in visits round schools.
- b) Yes, they were important at the political level especially where resistance was being offered. They took or pushed others to take important decisions. But they did not to my knowledge even interfere in what actually happened in schools, or even bothered to find out much of the reality.
- c) They were important to the extent that they were personally in favour of comprehensivisation. In ----- the Director was broadly sympathetic, so he took a positive line by setting up committees to produce guidelines, liaison groups for transfer from primary, working groups etc.
- d) Advisers were there to help, guide, cajole or persuade the reluctant. They were set up to be change agents, and exercised a subtle influence through principal teachers and sometimes heads.
- e) The Consultative Committee on the Curriculum was not interested

in organisational change, but curricular change. The undue attention given in Scottish schools to exams is a major deterrent to what I call 'human education' - there are other things in life than passing exams. How much do you (or anyone else for that matter) remember of your higher syllabuses or degree exam courses? So the Consultative Committee on the Curriculum both responded to the changes which had to come about due to comprehensivisation, and also generated or tried to generate change in the schools. It took comprehensive schools as a given. Its influence was uneven, given that it is an advisory rather than mandatory body. Much depended on heads and principal teachers. Consultative Committee on the Curriculum reports were either 'great' or a 'load of rubbish' depending on your views and educational philosophy. They organised conferences in the hope that one or two would go away convinced and persuade others - a multiplier principle, that was the psychology. So it acted in some senses as a catalyst for change in those who were disposed to act. But it met with opposition too. Curriculum papers are as important and influential as their readers want them to be.

7. The headteachers had no say in the overall form that reorganisation was to take. That was decided by Directors and their Committees. Strong and influential Directors could sway things in the situation where a Committee was not very political, or looked to him for guidance. But in the actual day-to-day organisation of it all in schools - heads and principal teachers - ran the show. They exercised control on internal organisation matters like the common course, mixed-ability etc. Some heads had to deal with very strong principal teachers, especially in

Maths and Modern Languages who carried their department behind them. Curricular and methodological decisions have traditionally rested with heads.

8. Parental reaction was mixed, and depended on:

- i) Their attitude to and appreciation of education
- ii) Whether they could get their child into a school where they would have the opportunity to do Highers. There was a definite fear amongst some that a comprehensive school would unnecessarily penalise the able children. The social aspect, related to social class, loomed large in cities. Some people actually moved to 'desirable' areas purely for educational reasons. Housing policy had created pockets of deprivation. For many parents, comprehensive education was a fine thing, as long as their own children were not adversely affected by its implementation.

9. Only to a certain extent in Scotland, and only most marked in Edinburgh and, to a lesser extent, Glasgow. Of course, some intelligent children were lost to state schools, but I do not think their absence was a serious drawback to the comprehensive move. It is a mistaken assumption that all children who attend private schools are able. Basically, the numbers involved in Scotland are so small.

10. Yes, because of shortsighted housing policies in post war Britain. Many schools in 'deprived' areas did very good work, sometimes under adverse conditions, providing very creditable courses for all their pupils - even up to Certificate of Sixth

11. Without question the major obstacle was the attitude which prevailed in the minds of people in important positions in education, especially heads and teachers. Remember that Circular 600 was just that - a circular, with no power to compel. The persistence of traditional attitudes resulted in the pace of change being uneven, and the widespread assumption that simply by having all pupils in one school you were operating a comprehensive system. Nevertheless, there were no outspoken recalcitrant authorities in Scotland as in England, and no court cases. Resistance was not vocal but furtive. The only real problem up here was local authority fee-paying schools.
12. Not very much integration took place certainly to start with. Again old attitudes meant that obstacles were put up to pupil integration, either over mixed-ability or the common course, or later. The old belief was expressed that 'some pupils can, some cannot'. It was very powerful, so much so that change was impossible or inconceivable for a lot of teachers. In general, I would say that upgraded junior secondary schools had a stronger drive to provide for all; this was noticeably lacking in 'downgraded' senior secondaries, or those which had to merge with junior secondary schools. The old Ordinary and Higher band-wagon rolled on, with its implication that any pupil that didn't get a national certificate wasn't worth a damn.
13. The rate and extent of change in internal school organisation was a function of the head's definition of and commitment to

comprehensive education. Obviously, if you think that Scottish Certificate of Education passes are the be-all and end-all, then you are not going to move much, are you? Look at the varied reception given to Curriculum Paper 2! Some of my own principal teachers thought that time devoted to 'minority' activities was time taken away from certificate subjects. Some people could not be convinced. Also, apart from a basic unwillingness to contemplate change, there was a lack of ingenuity and ability in some teachers to know where to begin in devising new curricula, or trying new methods.

14. A basic mistake made in the common course was that it was assumed that all pupils should have exactly the same diet. This is not on. Common course yes, common content no. There must be a recognition of and an attempt to cater for differing individuals. But group methods and individualised instruction - that's asking the impossible for some staff!
15. a) There was some effect. Attempts at integration of subjects were not popular. Given that some people refuse to accept that there is more to life than passing exams, the power of the individual department is strong, indeed predominates in the Scottish school. The national exam system determines much of what happens and creates attitudes of mind. A very common one is this: schools are there to enable pupils who can to get the exam passes necessary to enter university to get a degree to get a good job later in life.
- b) Basically there were two groups of teachers: those who decided

they couldn't cope because they had taught another way all their lives. In service courses had nothing to teach them. Others were more flexible, or simply recognised they needed help, or even saw it as a challenge to which they responded enthusiastically. Others who couldn't face the new set up either opted out or paid lip-service to its principles.

16. a) They either held up their hands in horror saying 'THIS IS NOT FOR ME', or gave some serious thought to the implications. Predominantly, I would say, many made a defence of the old system, sometimes vociferously sometimes silently.
- b) It was beneficial though voluntary. It acted as a contributor to change if the audience was convinced by what they heard at courses. So I would say it was constructive for those who wanted it to be. It provided some very good teaching materials for the enthusiasts. The key people in that kind of work were advisers and principal teachers. If the latter and the former were united in their desire for change well and good, if not Nevertheless, we have still not solved the problem of dealing with average or less able children, pace Standard grade developments. We are still largely a society constrained by the importance of qualifications and certificates. As a result, other aspects of education, equally valid, like personal/social development are relegated to a low position. In general, change in Scottish education has been seriously impeded by the power of the examination system, which has bolstered traditional elitist attitudes, and reinforced the position occupied by didactic teaching methods. When the system encourages the idea the teacher has the correct answer all the time, any desire for a

spirit of honest enquiry is stifled.

17. There has been a change in people's conception of what education is all about. There are significant differences, but the acceptance has been gradual and is still far from complete. Circular 600 and Circular 614 must take some of the credit for being a trigger to these developments. Change, any change, is slow in coming, particularly in education, where attitudes and values play such a big part. I would still maintain, however, that Scotland's schools do not see their primary function as educating for the sake of education; rather it is to prepare for exams to get qualifications in higher education and be successful. Much of value is ignored on the way.
18. The concept was to give every child an equal chance to achieve what it could without labelling it a failure. Of course, genuine equality of opportunity is impossible. Social factors see to that before children set foot inside a school. But, teachers also militate against attempts to operate it fairly, given their almost inbred tendency to make distinctions between pupils on the sole criterion of academic ability. As a consequence, some pupils get a raw deal and very little equality of opportunity.
19. a) A comprehensive school takes all the children from a defined area, apart from the mentally and physically handicapped. It should be a community school for anyone who wants to avail themselves of its facilities, and should provide an education in accordance with the aptitudes, abilities and interests of its varied population.

b) the variety of interpretation was - and is - amazing. Amidst the variety, the omnibus or bi-lateral school proved a strongly attractive proposition. It sounded sufficiently like what a 'comprehensive' school should be, and it had the advantages of having been around and accepted, even respected, for decades. This was the concept that was widely adopted, with its obvious implication: able kids we can deal with, the rest are a bloody nuisance. The traditional adherence to catering for the able has strongly coloured the form comprehensive education took in Scotland.

20. No, the potential has most certainly not been fully tapped, chiefly, in my view, for three reasons:

- i) Economic retrenchment and public spending cuts, which have successively inhibited educational developments
- ii) The hallowed place occupied by national exams
- iii) The continued existence of traditional attitudes to ability, the curriculum, teaching methods and the function of a school.

1. As a young teacher I did not know where the initiatives for comprehensive education came from. You must remember that many schools in Scotland were already comprehensive taking all the children from a locality. There were various patterns: either four year schools feeding six year ones, or six year schools with senior and junior secondary departments. My impression of the late 60's and 1970's was that a beleaguered teaching force had to do its best to unscramble many imposed changes, and make sense of them as best it could. In retrospect, the thinking for what happened in the 1970's had all taken place in the 1960's, a combination of the fact that a Labour government was elected in 1964, with a view of education in line with the social realities of the period, and the perceived failure of the education system as it then was.
2. Demands for a move to a comprehensive system certainly did not come from within the ranks of teachers, especially not those working in senior secondary schools. They felt as if they were being asked to cope with the impossible. It was never mentioned in training colleges. There were two educational worlds: the comfortable senior secondary and the hellish junior secondary, which bore the brunt of teacher shortage and/or unqualified staff. A mounting discontent with the dreadful 'education' that took place in most junior secondary schools was a factor in calls for comprehensive education, which, in cities, meant a merging of two worlds which were formerly miles apart.

3. I am honestly not sure whether the 1947 Report had much effect. I am more certain that the child-centred arguments of the Primary Memorandum (1965) made changes in the shape and type of education available in secondary schools.
4. The 'swinging' 60's were characterised by permissiveness and changes to established values. Education could not be an exception. There was also the population bulge and its consequential school building programme, both of which caused people to consider what form of education was most appropriate. The class structure was under threat, and education was believed to be an important element in the destruction of class barriers. Unfortunately, many of the school buildings which were already in existence, even those on one site, were ill-suited to the purposes of the new educational philosophy. ----- High School in ----- is a good example. It opened in 1962 and had three departments - senior secondary, junior secondary and modified.
5. The main implication of Circular 600 was that a teaching force separated by qualification (Honours degree, Ordinary degree, diploma) had to start to work together in their efforts to cope with pupils of all abilities. This was unsettling for many. Some teachers had never had certificate work before, and some had never seen pupils who could not read or write. Buildings were a problem, as I have said, and there was no extra funding available to resource a major change. Many schools had to operate with annexes - the old junior secondary school housing secondary 1/2, and the former senior secondary school for secondary 3 - secondary 6. Also, Circular 600 held major implications for

subjects, especially those like Latin and French, reserved formerly for the elite.

6. a) As a young teacher I hardly saw Her Majesty's Inspectors. They existed somewhere in Edinburgh.
 - b) My impression was that local politicians on Education Committees had a say, and shaped policy depending on their party allegiance. But there was a tremendous variation across counties in the level of resourcing.
 - c) Directorate staff explained policy to Elected Members and pointed out its implications. They are massively powerful.
 - d) The advisers got left with the nitty-gritty level - curriculum development in the schools. Their effect depended on personality. Some were excellent and went to Directorate meetings with handgrenades in their pocket. Others hadn't a clue where to start.
7. The whole of Scottish education in the late 60's and early 70's was a shambles. The single biggest obstacle to the introduction of comprehensive education in my opinion was that along with it, teachers were expected to cope successfully with a host of other massive changes: raising of the school leaving age, the Green Paper, Guidance, staff shortage, staff movement. The whole period was one of instability - more and more pupils, more and more expected of teachers with little or no training, or experience in what was being called for. It is not surprising that the majority did not come to terms with it all, given the relative lack of support they got.

9. Headteachers then had much more power to do as they wished than they have now. They showed tremendous variation. Some had educational vision and really tried. Others were dreadful and silently held up developments because of their educational philosophy.
10. The only parents who reacted were the middle class snobs who saw comprehensive education in social rather than educational terms. They objected to their children mixing with riff-raff. Other concerned parents agitated to have 4 year schools upgraded to 6 year ones, so that their children did not miss out. In rural areas there were no problems.
11. Area schools in big cities were one class ghetto establishments. People moved house to get their kids into a 'good' school. Private schools were intellectually comprehensive but social selective. The parents of their pupils were concerned so they were usually motivated. However, it is wrong to say that state schools suffered as a result of the existence of these other types of establishments.
12. Internal changes and reform came very slowly. Old elitist views and practices were only gradually diluted, and even yet have not disappeared. Secondary 1 was usually mixed-ability with some measure of grouping in secondary 2. Secondary 3/4 was the usual certificate/non-certificate mix. Only a few pioneering regions (e.g. Grampian) saw the potential benefits of Certificate of Secondary Education Mode 3 for non-academic children.

13. I feel that much in-service work was Scottish Certificate of Education exam orientated at a time when it should have been facing up to more fundamental issues e.g. syllabus design, mixed-ability methods, assessment in secondary1/2, management etc.
14. Headteachers and teachers were classifiable into various groups: died-in-the-wool traditionalists, enlightened but cautious traditionalists, or real visionaries. The latter group was the smallest, surprise, surprise! A lot had to do with age. The older ones did not want to throw the baby out with the bathwater, but very few consciously tried to frustrate developments. There used to be a saying about older staff: WHERE THERE'S DEATH THERE'S HOPE. To be fair to those who did try, they faced enormous problems - staff shortage and lack of resources.
17. Both the curriculum and methodology are now massively different. Classrooms are physically different. Teachers are much more conscious of their role as resource managers, and have taken on board the notion of educational provision on a multi-level basis. Also, since corporal punishment has been abolished, the atmosphere in schools is much better. Relationships are much less harsh and brutal.
19. The comprehensive school was both a radical and not radical creation. Much depended on whether you were in an urban or a rural setting. The problems were in Hamilton rather than Stranraer. Many places were used to catering for all children, albeit in a differentiated way.

21. A comprehensive school is one which treats every pupil as being
+
22. of equal value as a person, and attempts to meet the individual
needs - intellectual, social, moral and physical - of all its
pupils. Comprehensive education means catering for the
individual, and minimising feelings of rejection or
worthlessness. It's about what I call appropriate educational
provision, above all about not facing children with failure.
Although children come to school affected by the values current
in society, and influenced by their home circumstances, some of
the blame for the failure of comprehensive education to
fulfil its potential must be laid at the door of schools. Even
James Munn did not implement his curriculum in his own school!
There is still a caucus of headteachers who see me as an
educational nutcase. Maybe they are right, but I get annoyed
with their smug, self-righteous feeling that all is well. What I
want to change, they see as right and proper. Given that by
training and experience so many teachers, especially heads and
principal teachers remained thirled to old ideas and approaches,
and that teachers are cautious anyway, the arrival of
comprehensive education in Scotland can be likened to pouring new
wine into old bottles. Many people were competent and well-
meaning, but totally incapable of managing innovatory ideas. It
is only now in 1986 that their influence is beginning to be
eroded by more modern thoughts in education. Real changes in
education takes ages to make its effect felt.

Could I begin by saying this: comprehensive education just happened in Scotland. Like Topsy it just grew. There was a serious and inexcusable lack of planning and preparation for it. There was no sense of 'ALL CHANGE', as there should have been. The progress was ad hoc and intermittent.

1. You could find the embryonic scheme in the writings of Knox, but there was in my view no separate or distinctive Scottish initiative to launch comprehensive schools in Scotland. It happened here because the mood in England was for it. Circular 600 was the first talk of it in educational circles that I recall. You see many folk thought we already had comprehensive schools, but in fact they were more properly multilateral schools which were nicknamed 'comprehensive' because they took all the pupils from one area. In fact, the notion of the comprehensive school involved a fundamental if not revolutionary shift in thinking, but this did not happen, certainly not at the start. The result was that schools were comprehensive in name but did not embrace a comprehensive philosophy of education. The principal changes made were structural. No one really saw it as a basic change in educational outlook or approach. Many saw it narrowly - partly because of ill-advised publicity - as extending the opportunity of gaining Higher passes to everyone. Most folk in key positions running the system were academic by training and experience, but all were committed to varying degrees to obeying the political will, and attempts were made by 'management' to cajole, persuade or force the workers to take it all on board.

The whole comprehensive movement was promoted without conviction at the time. The concern was to change structures, certainly not thinking or practice or teachers' ideas.

2. Quite decidedly political. If it had not been for Anthony Crosland and his educational philosophy, and the fact that his party was in power, we would probably never had a comprehensive movement. There was no agitation for one up here, but there was, however, antipathy towards the control exam at primary and disappointment among influential parents. Comprehensives arrived, not because there was a burning desire to see schools of that type established, but rather because the move was to kill off the junior secondary sector and, by implication, selection at primary 7.
3. Its influence was misplaced in my view. Nothing happened to it for years, then in the 1960's people kept quoting it to justify the new comprehensive schools, when, in fact, it postulated omnibus or multilateral schools.
4. Largely because socialist philosophy was in the ascendant, and the notion of the comprehensive school fitted in with the Labour Party political platform. Equality, opportunity for all were the slogans of the day. These social objectives were a big problem in England, and, as far as education was concerned, there definitely were feelings of injustice and stigma attaching to the secondary modern school. There was a crisis of justice in education down south and this filtered up here. It was not a Scottish problem, nor was it perceived as one.

5. The main difference was that it shook the privileged position of the old established senior secondaries which had valued academic reputations, and were held in high regard because many in the community had reason to be grateful to them. They took a tumble and their fortunes declined. There was not a correspondingly proportional rise in the fortunes of upgraded junior secondary schools, which never lost their inferior reputation despite their new name. The change in staff attitudes which was needed never happened, especially among older colleagues. Sadly, the changeover caused a general reduction in the regard in which secondary education was held, more noticeable in a county in which it was traditionally prized. This is why many headteachers operated selection in their 'comprehensive' schools - an act of preservation of the old. I know of a few headteachers who were explicitly told by Directorate staff to ensure that the reputation of their schools did not suffer due to Circular 600 shortly after they were appointed.

It also meant that the death knell was sounded for junior secondary schools, in some of which quite outstanding work was achieved. I feel that some children got a better education in a good junior secondary than those of equivalent ability have subsequently received in some comprehensives.

6. 1) Her Majesty's Inspectors were told to go out and get others to embrace the new philosophy. I often felt that some of them could only have done it with a less than total sincerity. Men like Bennett and Shanks with Honours Degrees in Maths and Classics. It was asking a lot of them to change their educational colours just because the government had changed. This is the dilemma for

people who are government servants. Their belief was to sell it, and to be fair, they put on a good show, but I suspected their heart was not in it. The Inspectorate circus moved round the country giving seminars and talks to influence heads and Directors. They were very influential, using the normal weapons to make the point viz: 'IF YOU WANT TO GET ON, THE COMPREHENSIVE WAY IS IT.'

- 2) They were very powerful, especially in Labour controlled councils. They made the point by ensuring that the 'right' appointments were made.
- 3) They did not play a big part, and did not have much power. There was a wave of change in Scottish Certificate of Education syllabuses and exams, and they got involved in these. I think it became the fashion to have advisers, and everyone got in on the act. It developed as part of the education service, but no one gave them much thought. Their credibility was suspect as they had drifted away from the reality of the classroom. Many ended up as merely minor administrators in a sea of paperwork, rather than out there in the thick of promoting curricular change.
4. My impression was the Directorate never gave a lead, merely reacted to political pressure by their Committees or Her Majesty's Inspectors. They were not in the forefront of implementing change. They moved as far as they were pushed. They did little thinking of a coherent nature. No zeal or strategy was forthcoming from them.
6. The Consultative Committee on the Curriculum papers again were

produced in a reactive way, filling perceived needs, rather than leading the way in curriculum development. Many were paraded as having much more educational value than they had.

- 7.
- Teachers. No effort was made in a concerted way to convince them or get them to question long-held assumptions. Elitism reigned supreme. There was no intellectual argument or discussion over comprehensive education. It was not perceived as having the obvious implications it had. Reactions varied from reluctant compliance to silent obstinacy to move with the times.
 - Some parents were cynical. It was very much a case of 'comprehensives are O.K. as long as my child is not adversely affected by them'.
 - There were no Black Papers in Scotland, no official counter movement, just a quietly simmering dislike of the new system, and a polite unwillingness to play ball. The status quo was tenaciously adhered to despite semblances to the contrary.
 - Economic problems. No one sat back and counted the cost of implementing a true comprehensive system. The investment in plant and personnel would have had to be massive.
8. Headteachers, when you come right down to it, are in the forefront. Much of what they want happens. In this case, results were patchy. Genuine enthusiasts were few in number, and some of them had political rather than educational motives for their advocacy of comprehensive schooling. Others were public advocates, but sent their own children to private schools. This dented the credibility of the whole movement. Again, in general,

there was a conspicuous lack of conviction.

9. A lot of latitude was accorded to me. The prevailing ethos, certainly then, was that the head was appointed to run the school as he saw fit, particularly in matters of internal organisation and curriculum, in which there was never any external interference. This was a widely-held view, hence there were few external directives in this respect.
10. A mixture of worry, dismay or apathy depending on their interest in the education of their children. It was sold on the wrong ticket, and some parents were misled by politicians into thinking that all kids would get a clutch of Higher passes.
11. The main implications were organisational - especially in secondary 1/2, new curricula, new groupings. But the overriding impression is that it was really the old system watered down. Little serious educational thinking in curriculum was done.
13. Organisationally yes. In actual practice, what went on, not so much.
14. There was not enough in-service training, so that its influence was minimal. Attendance at courses was in any case voluntary, and confined to keen staff.
15. No experience of this, except losing pupils to the private sector.
16. As I have suggested above, reactions were mixed, with great

variation in real commitment to the comprehensive philosophy. Much internal practice was not radically altered for all the talk of change.

17. There was, in truth, a fair degree of separation of the former junior secondary and senior secondary pupils in the new comprehensive units. The overall effect tended not to be to the advantage of the able and, paradoxically, of even less advantage to the less able. Surreptitious selection on elitist principles continued as before. The aim was to preserve the best of the old, without a corresponding effort being made to do the best for the new aspects of the changed system to which, to a large extent, much lip-service was paid.
18. It should be recognised. See the Munn Report, Chapter Six. If you play down differing abilities all you do is create false expectations for some, and harm others by not stretching them. The question there is, not whether there should be differentiation, but when should it and how should it be done; and above all, what will teacher attitude be to the differentiated groups?
19. The curriculum changed, noticeably in new syllabuses and examinations. Teachers' attitudes and teaching methods did not undergo a corresponding change.
20. Not nearly enough. What scrutiny did go on was either superficial or confined to a few genuine enthusiasts who were trying their best to work 'comprehensively'. The predominant

concern was to defend and protect the old. Teachers felt secure doing that.

21. Circular 600 was seen to give official form to the existing pattern of multilateral/omnibus schools which existed in more rural areas. All the attention and talk about about the mechanics of change, not the philosophy. Comprehensive education was not put over to the educational world as a new concept.
22. Entirely in terms of allowing the able to pass exams and get on as far as they could. The advent of comprehensive schools was seen as extending this to a much wider group of pupils. The lad o' pairts tradition has proved very strong in Scotland. Unquestionably this was so, and comprehensive schools were seen as being able to create more lads o' pairts.
23. A comprehensive school is one in which the total resources of the school are organised in such a way as to create the happiest and most productive learning experience for each pupil according to his aptitude and needs. There must be a total approach on all fronts to do the best possible for all.
24. Not by a long chalk. The obsession with exams and paper certificates cripples thinking on education which is thereby reduced to a gradgrind process. Much has still to be done. Munn and Dunning made a promising start, but Standard grade has diluted their thinking a bit.

POSTSCRIPT

1. HAS

There have been dramatic changes in HAS since I joined in 1965. It was formerly open only to heads to six year selective schools, and was for a while dominated by private/independent school heads. It was a 1930s organisation for a while, an exclusive club. In the last decade it has opened out to all secondary heads and is now recognised as a body for consultation. In general, its level of thinking is much higher than it was. Membership was limited to senior secondary schools in the 60s - and not all of these were in membership. Activities in the main centred on three annual meetings - Edinburgh, Glasgow and Dunblane; and there was a sort of informality about proceedings. It was indeed in response to the development of 'comprehensive' secondary schools that the Association began to change in the 70s - reflected in a widening membership, in a more active participation in educational affairs, and in a greater and more systematic proliferation of documents.

While I do recall that HAS (naturally) took an interest in the fruits of Circulars 600 and 614 in the mid 60s, I don't remember a substantial questionnaire nor a significant report. But I wasn't a member of Council until 1969 - and could quite easily have missed it. What I do recollect was some strong opposition to the introduction of comprehensive schools by leading HAS members at the series of meetings arranged by Scottish Education Department at that time. The principal arguments were that it would prove to be far more expensive than its sponsors would be prepared to pay, that the notion was political rather than educational, and that the innovation in Scotland was a response to English rather than to Scottish needs. (You will recognise that there is some substance in some at least of these arguments!)

2. THE COMPREHENSIVE SCHOOL

This sort of school was never advertised and marketed. Possibly too much was left to the assumption that all would be well, as we in Scotland had had long experience of this kind of set up. The fact is we had not, so the real implications were dodged. There was no facing up to what was really involved. Hence, genuine comprehensive education never took root in Scotland for all the public statements to the contrary. Much pretence and simulation went on, and people deluded themselves that they were running a comprehensive system. The challenge simply was not taken up. The respect for traditional forms of schooling, and the understandable outlook of a majority of those in key positions at the time militated against a genuine spirit of innovation.

I'd better lay my cards on the table at the outset: I am an ardent comprehensivist and have fought for the comprehensive movement, and the betterment of comprehensive schools for many years.

I see the main obstacles to real comprehensive education as three:

1. Exams. No subject brings out ingrained attitudes as much as the threat to abolish national exams. At -----, after checking with all post school agencies that no children would be disadvantaged, I and my staff decided that we would not present for General Certificate of Education Ordinary level but for Certificate of Secondary Education Mode 3 which can be teacher-designed for all levels of ability. We had mixed-ability right up to fifth year. I had a hand-picked staff who produced a flood of new ideas. For a few glorious years we had a real comprehensive school, with appropriate supportive pastoral structures.
2. An inflexible, subject-dominated curriculum. The General Teaching Council with its strict rules about who can teach what does not exist in England. Up here the curriculum is very compartmentalized. In ----- I had 10 teaching departments with two departments which serviced them.
3. Lack of block timetabling - the bigger the units of time the better.

Educationally ----- is more backward than ----- but in community terms it is the reverse. Ordinary and Higher grade exams are God-like in their importance and influence, and subjects are definitely seen as a hierarchy. My view is that if a subject is held to be worth teaching, and has justified its place in the curriculum then it should get its fair share of human and financial resources in the school. A head should do all he can to make all departments feel equally valued and playing an important part in the education offered at the school.

Exams and a narrow, subject-centred view of education destroy the ethos of comprehensive education, and the structures erected in their name destroy the dignity of a lot of kids. I take the view that Circular 600 was a step in the right direction in as much as it removed the awful demarcation between senior secondary/junior secondary in Scotland. But we should not delude ourselves that we have thereby introduced a comprehensive system of education. Part of the problem is that we should be engaged in an educative process, and set out quite deliberately to TEACH people what comprehensive education is really about. Many do not genuinely know, or have imposed a personal version on their staff and pupils. Parents too need to be educated as to what we are about. We must also always be aware that we are public servants and employees ourselves. Parents, directors, Her Majesty's Inspectors all have expectations of what schools should do, so as an educational thinker you must walk the tightrope which spans the gulf between these societal expectations and what you know should be happening as a grit-feeling. You must, for credibility reasons, show you can come up with the academic goods, while taking as many opportunities as you can to declare that your school has other equally valid goals to chase.

But old attitudes surface whenever you raise fundamental educational or philosophical issues. As a head you must listen to staff and take them with you. You cannot blunder through. Nevertheless, I cannot help thinking that the educational system as it is presently operating is ineffective for a lot of kids. You should ask yourself the question: WHAT IS SCHOOL DOING FOR AND TO KIDS? In a great many cases, the answer is not very much. As long as they behave the system papers over the cracks in the provision. If they do not and become non-conformists, they are branded as lepers, and excluded into society to become a rolling stone, possibly becoming involved in a life of crime.

However, to be fair, things have moved. Guidance is a basic improvement, and a fundamental part of any comprehensive school. As many staff as possible should be involved in the social education programme as first-time guidance teachers. Things like work experience, community service, drama have all helped, but we are still far away from having truly integrated courses. We have not moved much on language across the Curriculum. That corporal punishment is now banned is a quantum leap forward.

Headteachers have undoubted power, and can still get away with a lot of innovation if they are brave enough. But they are also only human, and can only work to the strengths and weaknesses of their staffs, and must constantly be aware of the external expectations held by many people. They work under tremendous constraints and can be put under a lot of pressure by the local authority. As a group, heads tend to be conservative, and lose any vision or daringness they had as they get older. Her Majesty's Inspectors I have always found to be progressive and generally ahead of the present in educational terms. The Advisory

service too tends to attract progressive, innovatory recruits, who do a first-class job in converting or trying to convert the more blinkered practitioners. But Directors have little time for educational philosophising, visiting schools and getting to know their staffs and heads. They become bogged down and swamped by administrative demands - a welter of paper and meetings. They lose touch and credibility as a result, and must look to the Advisory Service and Her Majesty's Inspectors as the visionaries and thinkers.

GLASGOW
UNIVERSITY
LIBRARY: